PUBLISHERS OF LAW BOOKS
PRINTERS AND BOOKBINDERS
The Cassell Company
LIMITED

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

1897

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XXIX

Tuesday, March 13th, 1951.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Third readings. Order No. 1.

THE POLICE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order; third reading, B ill No. 95, "An Act to Amend The Police Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 95," An Act to amend The Police Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE PRIVATE FOREST RESERVES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order; third reading, Bill No. 106, "An Act to amend The Private Forest Reserves Act", Mr. Scott.

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 106, An Act to amend The Private Forest Reserves Act.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

THE HOMES FOR THE AGED ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order; third reading, Bill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Homes For The Aged Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I move third reading of B ill No. 82, "An Act to amend The Homes For The Aged Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order; third reading, Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I move third reading of Bill No. 83, "An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the Motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE PUBLIC OFFICERS FEES ACT

CLERK OF THE House: Fifth Order; third reading, Bill No. 101, "An Act to amend The Public Officers Fees Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 101,"An Act to amend The Public Officers Fees Act."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

GAS PIPE LINES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order; third reading, Bill No. 108, "An Act respecting Gas Pipe Lines", Mr. Gemmell.

Hon. W.S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 108,"An Act respecting Gas Pipe Lines."

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 23.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES IN ONTARIO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 23rd Order; second reading, Bill No. 121, "An Act to Promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario", Mr. Frost.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 121, "An Act to Promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario."

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on the second reading of this Bill, I shall not elaborate greatly upon the statement which I made on the 15th February on the introduction of that Bill which, because of administrative changes and alterations, with, also, the addition of a matter relating to Trade Unions, was substituted for by a new Bill introduced last Thursday now standing on the Order Paper as Bill No. 121. As stated at that time, we already have on our Statutes the Racial Discrimination Act of 1944 which, I believe, was the first Act of its kind and, indeed, the first relating to that subject which was passed in Canada. That Act was designed to prevent the matter of, in advertising, discrimination against any person or classes of persons because of race or creed. We have further the amendment of last year to The Conveyancing and Law Property Act which prevents discriminatory covenants on the same ground and which, as I said here a few days ago, is now re-enforced and supported by the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada which, in fact, we rather anticipated last year. The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), with his usual discernment, rather indicated that he thought that that was the law. That has been since declared to be the law by the highest Court in our land. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this House might bear that in mind, that our hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) has a great knowledge and appreciation of the laws of this land and of their interpretations, and I would just draw the attention of the House to the fact that he expressed an opinion last year in this House that since has been given effect to or has been affirmed by a

decision of the Supreme Court of Canada. We also last year passed, and we have on the Statutes in The Labour Relations Act, a provision preventing discrimination in the matter of arrangements and provisions in collective bargaining agreements in this province; and now we have an Act concerning fair employment practices in Ontario.

In Ontario -- and I use this word again because I used it yesterday and I believe it has relation to these matters -- we have pioneered in these matters and in these three Acts have placed our government in the forefront in Canada, and not only in Canada, Mr. Speaker, but I believe in most countries in the world. There are few countries in the world which can show a record of legislation such as we have in these four enactments. With respect to the importance of it I may elaborate very briefly. May I here point out that while initially there was considerable opposition to this type of legislation in the United States, I may say, Mr. Speaker, that it was in the United States that this type of legislation first came into being. I think in our system, in our progress in democracy, in the progress we have made in our laws, and in our attitude towards the human being, we may well pay tribute here to the place the United States, a young nation, has taken in the democratic world, and, indeed, in all of the world, I have great admiration for the American people. When we look back and we consider that it is less than 200 years, indeed, not a very great deal over 1950 years since that great Nation came into being, when we look at the progress that has been made, the ideas of democratic

government they have given to the world, the contribution they have made to the world, we cannot help but have admiration for our great American neighbour, our American cousin; and I think it is proper here to pay tribute to them in this connection, that this type of legislation is definitely an out-growth of the American thought and the American contribution to democracy. Opposition to this type of legislation is, in the United States, growing less. Of course, Mr. Speaker, their problem is different from ours. Indeed, they have a very difficult problem. One has only to consider and study the history of the American Nation to know that that is the case. We here in Canada are sympathetic to the problem they have.

We in the western world have undertaken in the United Nations Charter to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and freedom for all without distinction, on account of sex, language and religion. The passage and enforcement of such civil rights legislation, after all, is one of the great tests of democracy and of our way of life upon which western democracy will be judged by millions of people throughout the world who are engaged presently in the racial and political revolutions of our century. I think this is undoubtedly true, that, in this first half of the twentieth century and particularly in the last 35 years, we have been too close to events to appraise them. Some day historians will record these days in which we live as days of great and fundamental changes in the thinking of mankind. I think that this legislation

and the attitude we here take in connection with it, is part of the times in which we live. There are influences in this world which point to the deficiencies in the matter of civil rights. By propaganda they seek to persuade the people of the so-called backward areas of the world, those countries which are striving for a semblance of economic security and individual rights, that the western democracies are insincere in their efforts to promote international justice. Those of us who live in these days and, indeed, those of us who have since 1914 seen the very commencement of the revolution, if I may term it in that way, know that this is incorrect.

I was much impressed, as I know many of the hon. members of this House were, by an address which I heard over the CBC by Senator Wayne Morse on January 12 last. Perhaps some of the hon. members here heard him. I was very much impressed by what he said. I could not help but think that his attitude was a great and generous one with respect to the problems of to-day, and was an indication of the tremendous place that the American union is taking in this world of to-day. Senator Morse said in part:

> "The struggle for peace, which is the major crisis of our generation ---"

and that is true.

> "---is a struggle for men's minds rather than their emotions. It is a struggle for human decency rather than for human debauchery. It involves an appeal to reason. Peace can be won and maintained

> only if we can convince freedom-loving people everywhere in the world that the rules of reason, procedures of international justice, relinquishment of many selfish interests, must be substituted in the thinking of people everywhere in the world for the emotional nationalism which dominates the world in spite of our laudatory efforts to set up a system of international justice through law by way of the United Nations."

I recommend the reading of his address to all hon.members present.

I may say, as one of many hon. members here, who, as I say, have seen this thing from its commencement -- I have seen it from the days when we saw our gallant troops marching down the streets of Ontario towns 36 or 37 years ago -- we know that our whole efforts, our whole thought has been towards the elimination of war and for the substitution of a rule of law and justice among people and among nations. That, I think, is our thought. After all, we are men and women of peace.

The legislation which is now before the House can be viewed from two standpoints; first, as our obligation to the United Nations, under whose banner, I said a few days ago, we are. Property and civil rights is a matter for the provinces. The matter with which we are now dealing is a matter primarily for the provinces. The federal government cannot very well pass legislation of this sort; therefore, in passing

such legislation, we are making contribution to the furtherance of the ideals of the Charter to which our Canadian government has subscribed, and represented the views and the feelings of the people of our nation. Secondly, there is an obligation to ourselves. We have to live with ourselves, and our principles are our own, not because they are dictated or indicated by somebody else, but because we believe in them. It is our belief that, as a people in Ontario, all men, of whatever race, colour or creed, must be accorded equity and the fundamental rights of the human person; equity and respect due to man's dignity; equity before the law; and equity in rights of employment. Mr. Speaker, our people believe in those things. They subscribe to these principles. They believe in them. While this Act is, in a sense, pioneering in Canada, we believe that it is a sane and a practical approach to the problem.

I do not think it is necessary for me to elaborate on the machinery set up in the Act. After all, it is simple and common sense, and I hope it carries with it the approval of the hon. members of this House. The nature of the machinery is essentially the same as that which we have used and developed in our labour relations legislation. We know that it will work. I may say that the emphasis, of course, is laid upon conciliation rather than on sanctions. By emphasis on sanctions and penalties we can create bad feeling which would do, as I have said before, more harm than good. We do not want to do more harm than good; we want to take a line of legislative action

which will do good. This legislation, we believe, wisely puts sanctions in the background. We believe that our people as a whole want this legislation. We realize that violations of the fundamentals of this legislation might well be more thoughtless than intentional. I think there may be cases which will appear to be violations of this legislation, but which will be more thoughtless than intentional. Therefore, through the machinery set up in this Act, we have laid the ground where people of good will can come together if there are differences and solve them and that penalties will be reserved for the flagrant violations which we here hope -- and I think with some confidence-- will seldom if ever happen in this province of ours.

Mr. Speaker, I may say that some mention was made here yesterday of this Act in relation to the Act concerning, if I may use the expression, equal pay for equal work. I use that with deference to the hon. member for York East (Miss Macphail), who likes that expression so much. Therefore, I will not use the name which we thought was a very good name for the Act. I will say quite frankly that the legislation which we introduced here some weeks ago, on February 15th, in relation to fair employment practices, certainly did influence our decision to bring in the Act which was given second reading here yesterday unanimously of this House. We introduced that legislation because we recognized that there was, we felt, room for legislation in regard to discrimination in relation to race, colour and creed, and it did seem to us that we might go further

and round things out by introducing the Act, which as I say, was given second reading in this Legislature yesterday. This Act, I believe, helps to round out the circle and to give expression to what I think are the real thoughts and aspirations of the people of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 121, and I commend it to the House.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, this group is very happy that the government has at last vindicated our position by introducing Bill No. 121, The Fair Employment Practices Act, the principles of which we agree to. They have arrived circuitously and with much pushing to the conclusion (after seven long years) that there are illnesses in our society. That there are gaps in our Democratic fences.

A Fair Employment Practices Act should be designed to do the job smoothly and expeditiously. Firstly: it should convey to all and sundry that discrimination is undemocratic and will not be tolerated. Secondly: by the process of education it should be brought home to our citizens how unreasonable and unjust discrimination really is. Thirdly: the punitive section should demonstrate to what degree the government views the gravity of infractions of its legislation. Fourthly: the machinery to carry out the Act should be designed to move speedily.

The Minister of Labour stated in discussing another Bill that since the government was breaking new ground, at least for them, that it might be necessary after a year's trial to amend it. Now, Mr. Speaker, that

is something we should endeavour to avoid in an Act of the nature of The Fair Employment Practices Act. Senator Wayne Morse, who has had a great deal of experience with this type of legislation stated this most emphatically when he spoke here in Toronto. He declared that legislation of this type should be prepared most carefully, as the success or failure oft' times depended on its initial impact on the public.

We, in this group have had much experience in dealing with cases of discrimination and after weighing very carefully the provisions of this Bill and the modus operandi, we have come to the conclusion it will not do the job or reach its objectives. While it is true that I have not got the political experience or political senility that the Prime Minister seems to feel is so essential, I feel I have other attributes I would far sooner have my grandchildren hear about. To my mind, this is "smog" legislation.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

I move, seconded by Mr. Wismer, that the motion now before the House be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that" and substituting the following:

> "In the opinion of this House, Bill No. 121 'An Act to Promote Fair Employment Practices in Ontario' if enacted, will not achieve its avowed purpose of promoting observance of the principles of non-discrimination since it does not provide for educational activities and is effective in its enforcement procedures: and
>
> "that therefore the said Bill be not now read a second time but that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Labour with instructions to hear evidence and representations from qualified experts and interested organizations and draw up for presentation to this House a Bill that truly expresses the principle of non-discrimination".

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this group I think we should give acknowledgment as far as it is due. This is the day on which the government is entitled to such credit as it may take for having at last made a step which I think we all agree goes in the right direction. I had hoped that the likeable hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) was going to go much further into the principle of the Bill. But, strategy having ruled otherwise I think perhaps that I am not excused from doing so.

MR. FROST: They got their instructions, you see.

MR. CALDER: Well, our group here takes instructions from nobody and no source except our own conscience.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): How about Walter Thompson?

MR. CALDER: His conscience is as good as ours. We are perfectly prepared when the time comes to support as much progress as can be found in this Bill. I do not think one can gloss over the lengthy stages it has taken to develop this Bill.

I am not going to criticize the government for the provision that has been inserted looking towards national security. There are people who think that the cold war is nothing but an irritant to sell newspapers but to anyone who thinks as I do that the cold war is just as near and as real as this desk, then I think it is only realistic to make the provisions somewhat along the lines it has been made for what can be extremely important in an era of cold war. Two years ago I remember mentioning privately to the Chairman of Hydro something about security for the transformer stations and Hydro has now taken security steps. Well, to get right down to it, one has to recognize that employment practices in certain aspects have got to be circumscribed with safeguards. Cannot we depend upon the good sense of the director of the Department of Labour, in this field? -- That is an experiment I think we ought to try and I do not consider that in 1951 a blemish on the principle of this Bill -- I hope a generation from now, if not sooner, that we can wipe out that section.

There is a real blemish which the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) did not have time to touch upon and that is, that as in yesterday's affair, there seems to be no real attempt to get right down to giving women the place

in law that they are seeking and which by the universal Declaration of Human Rights referred to by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), they are entitled to. I was interested in what the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said, that this Bill "expresses the aspirations" of the people of Ontario. Well, in this case, Mr. Speaker, it is the first step that is important and I think today we should take that long first step by adopting this Bill in its present form if we have to, if we cannot get it in an improved form. But, why not give aspirations legal effect. Bills are not supposed to give expression to aspirations that can be done much more eloquently in speeches by Cabinet Ministers and perhaps by the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail). When you come to a Bill what you want is an expression of legal intent and this Bill stops short of giving women that recognition which by the universal Declaration they are entitled. The second article of that Declaration says that everyone is entitled to all the rights set forth in this Declaration without discrimination of any kind, such as colour, language, sex, religion, political or otherwise. And then, coming right down to the point, article 23 says that first of all everyone has the right to work, to the free choice of employment and favourable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. Mr. Speaker, when the best and appropriate time comes to achieve this object this group is prepared so to move.

I should like to put on Hansard some classic English which if nobody else does I hope the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will appreciate.

MR. PORTER: I shall if it is classic.

MR. CALDER: It comes from John Milton.

MR. WALTERS: That is too far back for him.

MR. CALDER: And it relates to that other type of liberty so long ago when Milton was arguing that one should not be discriminated against in the right of publishing simply because he was going to publish something not pleasing to the authorities.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, this House, for all its seeming indifference, is taking another historic step in that same march of liberty because now we are going to say a person should not be dropped from employment because the employer may not like his or her complexion or background or religion. As far as we in this Legislature can go, it is a perfectly worthwhile ambition. We are going to try to equate the rights of employment. I hope at no time in this House and, if it is not too much to hope for, that outside this House people are not going to argue that we are trying to create men equal by an Act of the province of Ontario. Let us not get drawn aside by that red herring; what this will do is equate the right to employment. That is a purpose to which I think we should all apply ourselves because, I have no doubt the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) is right, this Bill will be back next year for considerable improvement. But, in this historic march I was speaking about, if hon. members listen and have an ear for double meanings they can find not only a reference to civil defence, they can also find a compliment to this administration and they can also hear a reference to the general election of 1951.

MR. PORTER: Probably it has nothing to do with the Bill but let us hear it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CALDER: It comes from Milton.

MR. DUNBAR: Do not pose, read it.

MR. CALDER:

"First when a city shall be as it were beseiged and blocked about, her navigable river infested, inroads and incursions round, defiance and battle oft' rumoured to be marching up even to her walls, and suburbs trenches, that then the people, or the greater part, more than at other times, wholly taken up with the study of highest and most important matters to be reformed, should be disputing, reasoning, reading, inventing, discoursing, even to a rarity, and admiration, things not before discoursed or written of, argues first a singular good will, contentedness and confidence in your prudent foresight, and safe government, Lords and Commons; and from thence derives itself to a gallant bravery and well grounded contempt of their enemies, as if there were no small number of as great spirits among us, ---"

Hon. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Are you sure you have the right place?

MR. CALDER: If the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) does not understand ---

"as his was, who when Rome was nigh besieged by Hannibal being in the city, bought that piece of ground at no cheap rate, whereon Hannibal himself encamped his own regiment.

Next it is a lively and cheerful presage of our happy success and victory. For as in a body, when the blood is fresh, the spirits pure and vigorous, not only to vital, but to rational faculties, and those in the acutest, and the pertest operations of wit and subtlety, it argues in what good plight and constitution the body is, so when the cheerfulness of the people is so sprightly up, as that it has, not only wherewith to guard well its own freedom and safety, but to spare and to bestow upon the solidest and sublimest points of controversy, and new invention, it betoken us not degenerated, nor drooping to a fatal decay, ---"

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Louder.

MR. CALDER: And this part merit louder reading: "but casting off the old and wrinkled skin of corruption to outlive these pangs and wax young again, ---"

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CALDER:

"entering the glorious ways of truth and prosperous virtue destined to become great and honorable in these latter ages. Methinks I see in my mind a noble and puissant nation rousing herself like a strong man after sleep, and shaking her invincible locks: Methinks I see her as an eagle muing her mighty youth,

and kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam; purging and unscaling her long abused sight at the fountain itself of heavenly radiance, while the whole noise of timorous and flocking birds, with those also that love the twilight, flutter about, amazed at what she means, and in their envious gabble would prognosticate a year of sects and schisms."

Well, Mr. Speaker, that may look better in Hansard than it may have sounded but it is not uninteresting to know that Milton's own appeal which is not considered a classic of English created not the slightest ripple at the time it appeared.

MR. DUNBAR: File that book with the Clerk of the House.

MR. PORTER: Is the hon. member (Mr. Calder) for or against the Bill?

MR. CALDER: For.

MR. FROST: For the Bill?

MR. CALDER: In this group, Mr. Speaker, we are for the Bill, of course.

MR. FROST: With reservations?

MR. CALDER: When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) speaks of reservations, I wonder what passed through his mind when he withdrew Bill No. 90 and brought in this one. Of course there are reservations. To me that is perfectly normal procedure. There does not seem to be any subject for ridicule that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should have improved his throughts on more mature consideration and I commend him for pulling out the first Bill because, for instance, it did not have in it that provision for Trade Unions which the hon.

member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) had in his Bill and I had in mine.

MR. FROST: We disagreed on that point.

MR. SALSBERG: No, I think it was his only, they will do the right thing.

MR. CALDER: The trade union people have the same human nature as the rest of us and therefore should be treated the same as all the rest of us.

MR. WALTERS: You do not expect it to be different?

MR. CALDER: Why should it? So I say to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), it is well to have reservations even in his own mind and it matters only what you produce in the end. The great objection, of course, is the failure to give real effect to the equality of rights of women and when the time comes that will be dealt with. I think that is the position.

MR. FROST: Could I ask the hon. member (Mr. Calder) if he had that in his Bill that he introduced on the first or second day of this session, anything about sex?

MR. CALDER: No, but I too have made advances.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Where did you think that one up?

AN hon. MEMBER: Why not read Horatius at the Bridge?

MR. CALDER: Perhaps the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) pioneered in this but certainly last year the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) presented in his name the Bill with this amendment, the C.C.F. had their Bill and last year ---

MR. PORTER: Apparently you are not satisfied with any of the Bills?

MR. CALDER: No, certainly not satisfied with yours.

MR. FROST: We will see if he is satisfied with it when it comes time to vote on it.

MR. CALDER: Let us not be worried about principles of the thing, the principle is fair but the language is not entirely fair but, for the principle, of course, we will accept it and hail it but when we get right down to the fine point where it really begins to apply and where, I am afraid, as was mentioned yesterday, the hopes of a great many people are going to be disappointed. This Legislature as a whole has a duty which it must not laugh off.

MR. FROST: Half a loaf is better than no bread.

MR. CALDER: The duty which the Opposition in this Legislature has is to bring it along and those Bills which we brought in last year, all three of them brought this response from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) -- that was a year and ten days ago, on March 23, 1950, and in Hansard at page G-6 the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) expresses himself as being "extremely doubtful" as to the worth of the legislation in this country.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

MR. DUNBAR: That is a fine point. I am afraid he has "got something" there.

MR. CALDER: We have the government now committed to the principle, and I have no doubt when the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) asks the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters), the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and myself to discharge our Bills, we can do it with good conscience, because the greatest step is the first one, and now, as far as it goes, it is being taken, and let us all join in the efforr to make sure that the first step is as far as can be made, and in the years to come, when you get down to the enforcement of it, -- and I know the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) will be sympathetic -- here is the place where you cannot just take anybody, but you will have to ask for people skilled not only in labour, but also with social-work training, because unless you have that kind of person on your staff, you will not get understanding administration.

There are bound to be disappointments. We know there are people so sensitive that no matter what slight they suffer, they attribute it to their race, or religion or complexion, and that kind of people will have no help from this Bill, and should never expect to.

A High Court Judge told me to be careful about this legislation, because if we do away with every type of minority rights, then what rights will minorities have? That is the risk I think we should be prepared to take, because such rights as minorities have are not legal, except in a very few instances; they are mainly political. We will discharge our Bills, Mr. Speaker, in the hope that the government, more than yesterday, will come down to the point of making these

Bills say in black and white now what the Declaration of Human Rights has said, and what the men and women of this province really want it to say.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St.Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I rise to welcome the Bill that is now before us, even though the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) has, a moment ago, labeled it as "half a loaf".

MR. PORTER: Oh, I did not label it at all.

MR. SALSBERG: I welcome it because it is a very important step forward. It fulfills a need which was recognized by the overwhelming majority of the people of this province. As I said on a previous occasion, when another Bill was introduced which sought to eliminate certain discriminatory practices, and I want to say it again today that the hon. member who introduced the Bill--this time the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost)-- is very fortunate indeed in having that opportunity and privilege. I say this fully aware of the weaknesses of the Bill, and I shall deal with them, but I am certain that this legislation, whether it will be amended--as I hope it will be--or whether it will be adopted as it is at the moment, will be discussed and referred to far beyond the province, far beyond the country by many people who are concerned with the attainment of equality of treatment for people. Many pieces of legislation introduced here, and which will be carried, will have perhaps been forgotten when this Bill will still be referred to and remembered as the basis for what will undoubtedly become a more perfect piece of legislation.

In saying all this, Mr. Speaker, I cannot join with my very good friend, the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) who said he was happy to welcome this legislation. I, frankly speaking, am not very happy. I would prefer -- as undoubtedly every hon. member of this House would prefer-- that conditions would make such legislation entirely unnecessary. I think that is true for every hon. member, every group and every party in this House. We would all be happier if there was no need for such legislation, and we would all be more satisfied if there was no sign of discrimination, of bigotry and unfairness in the realm of employment opportunity.

But we all recognize that unfortunately that ideal state of affairs does not exist, and that legislation of this sort is, therefore, necessary.

In saying this, I want to also make this point; I do not think it would be correct to create the impression that discrimination in employment is rampant in the province of Ontario. The majority of people are decent and fair, and democratically-minded. I agree with all the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said about that before. But a minority does practice discrimination, and legislation is, therefore, necessary to cope with the unfair action of a minority. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, -- and I have spoken about this in the House for a number of years -- the majority of people are honest, they do not steal. It is only the few who do, and yet we enact legislation to curb the few who will take away that which belongs rightfully to another, and it is in the same sense that this legislation is required to curb, and to outlaw the actions of the minority which does practice discrimination.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am fully aware of

such practices. I am probably the only member in this House who has experienced discrimination. I have experienced the indignity, and very often the disadvantage of being discriminated against as has been done, and is being done to this day, by narrow, bigoted, unsure people -- small people-- who are bigoted without understanding why, who have prejudices without probing them and understanding their roots, people who suffer from some insecure feeling that causes them to seek to assert themselves by lording it over others.

In essence this practice, like all forms of discrimination, is very harmful not only to the person who suffers from discrimination, but to those who practice it, even if they do not understand it. It degrades them; it reduces the degree of decency which must express itself in all their relationships, and it is, of course, bad for the community and the country as a whole.

In essence, it is a Fascist practice which only Fascists have justified, and to that extent this Bill -- limited though it may be -- this legislation is desirable. It will not accomplish all that people may expect from it, but I agree with the opinion expressed by the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) on other occasions, that you cannot merely remove such obstacles by laws alone; there are social factors, economic factors, and some psychological factors which we have to recognize, to try and overcome and eliminate, but the law is important in that it declares such actions to be wrong, and illegal, and places it beyond the pale of decent behaviour, and when necessary, can be enforced.

I said before, Mr. Speaker, that there are minorities which practice discrimination, and I am prepared to say here -- and say it with full responsibility -- that there

are certain types of business which unfortunately have practiced discrimination for a long time. I think our large insurance offices have been practicing discrimination in the realm of employment has been in an offensive and in a defiant manner. I think some of our Banks are doing it to this day. I think some of our departmental stores are doing it to this day. I had the unhappy experience of finding a young girl employed in a certain department store, which I knew did not employ anyone of her national origin, and I asked her how it was that she got the job, and she told me, "I changed my name slightly, and I wrote on the application that I was a Presbyterian".

AN hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

MR. SALSBERG: I told her she had no business doing that, that she had better have gone elsewhere to seek employment, but evidently the need for a job was great, and that girl did it. I repeat that most of the departmental stores are practicing discrimination.

Whenever I cite cases of discrimination I have in the past always pointed to the Canadian newspapers, which, in my opinion, are by and large setting a better example. I think that is true of all the newspapers in this City. I think it is true generally of the Canadian newspapers across the land. I think they are setting an example which many private industries could well follow.

I had occasion some years back to draw the attention of the House to shocking cases of discrimination. Some of it occurred during the period when the country was involved in war against Fascism and racism but paradoxically, we had shameful examples of such discrimination even then.

We had a case -- and I say "we" because I mentioned it in this House -- where an ammunition plant sent back a worker sent by the Selective Service, and unashamedly said in rejecting him, where they had to provide a reason, "Nationality". They were in need of workers, but they rejected this man, and in their own handwriting said "The reason; nationality".

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Probably they knew him.

MR. SALSBERG: Did I hear anybody say the Bill would take care of that? I do not know what the reference was. Never mind; I did not hear it said; perhaps it is better not heard.

I might say there were other instances which I at one time brought to the attention of this House when discussing the need for legislation of this kind. For example, a young man of 18, out of a job, whose father was away from home in the Armed Forces, and whose brother was in the Air Force overseas was not welcomed at all by the employer. I was in touch with the employer. Unfortunately, the objection came from other sources than the employer, from his supervisory staff, and the employer said he was sorry, but he could not do anything about it. I could go on citing many more examples of discriminatory practices, which I hope this legislation will curb, if not completely eradicate.

I want to say to the hon. members of this House that discrimination is like a disease; it does not necessarily stop with one limb; it spreads. Often it is on religious grounds, and you will find, I am sure, cases

where in certain areas a person of a certain religious group will find it difficult to get employment, while in another area you will find a person of another religious group having difficulty in securing employment. There was a time not so very long ago, when men coming from England had a hard time getting employment, and the employers posted signs saying "No Englishmen required". That is true.

It manifests itself in various forms. I was recently approached by a young chap, a second-generation Canadian, of Ukranian origin, who had difficulty in securing employment because his name was foreign sounding, and he had to change his name, he found it so difficult to find employment.

Hence this legislation is desirable, and we welcome it, because we hope it will fulfill the objectives which we, and all others, have placed before the government when discussing this type of legislation.

Now then, May I say another word about the role of government and its place in this legislation? No doubt the B ill will stand as a credit to the government, and I think deservedly so. It is a government measure, the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) name is indelibly written on it, his name is inseparable from the Bill, and he is a very fortunate man, and I congratulate him for having brought the Bill in. I think, however, that it should be recognized, that it is not partisan legislation; that the Bill now, aside from its weaknesses, is no longer a government piece of legislation, or a one-party piece of legislation. We know the Bill was advocated by other

groups.

As regards our group, we have been urging it for seven years. I have ain my hand a copy of a letter which I wrote to the then Premier (Mr. Drew), dated 1944, in February, in which I provided him, upon his request, with an outline of legislation that is required, and the first item was "to make it unlawful for any person, firm, corporation or board to deny employment to any person on account of race, colour or creed, or to publish or advertise or announce the intention to practice such discrimination."

Bills were introduced by us, bearing my name, in an attempt to achieve something like that.

Then the C.C.F. group introduced a Bill divorcing this special phase of the problem from the over-all Bill they had introduced to this House.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

Then the Liberal group introduced the Bill. Now the government has introduced legislation which will undoubtedly pass. I say, therefore, that by now the Bill, despite the weaknesses it may have, will pass unanimously. There is no doubt about that. I think I am right in prognosticating that, though we would like to see it improved and strengthened. It will be legislation desired by all parties, advocated by all parties, and supported by all parties. I think that is the way it should be with legislation of this sort.

Now a few words on the Bill, itself: I appreciate the feeling of the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) and others who would like to see the Bill strengthened. So would we. This Bill which replaces the earlier Bill introduced by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has a certain improvement and perhaps a certain weakness. My own personal opinion is that the establishment of a director is an improvement. That is my own feeling about it. I would rather see a board, a special board set up, but I do think it is better to have it this way than to refer it to the Labor Board, as such. I think that is at least a beginning in the separation of the tasks and it will be broadened.

On the other hand, there is a weakness in the new Bill in that it leaves the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) less obligated than the former Bill did. I want to draw that to the attention of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). His early Bill said that the Minister "shall" do certain things, using the word "shall" throughout. The new draft says "may" instead of "shall". I wondered

whether there was any reason for changing the word. I would rather see it in the form contained in the first draft which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) introduced.

There is another question which arose in my mind about the Bill as compared to the earlier draft. The early draft, I think, left it quite clear that anybody could lay a complaint, whereas this draft of the Bill limits it to the person discriminated against. I regret this change. I do hope that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will agree with me that a change back to the original phraseology or wording would be desirable, rather than limiting it to the person discriminated against. It should be broadened, as the original draft contained it. It is in section 6 of the Bill. The original draft made it possible for others to do that. Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind is this: Organizations, responsible bodies, may be aware of discriminatory practises which they desire to see eliminated. They would want to lay the facts in their possession before the director or before a Board, if it eventually came into being, so that the board or the director might act on the complaint and on the facts placed before them. As it is worded now I think they would be barred from doing that. I do not think it is necessary. I ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to give this consideration and perhaps place in the Bill the original words contained in that section.

In section 7 there is an absolute need for adding a few words. I am sure it is only an oversight which is involved. I recommend them to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for consideration. Mr. Speaker, may I say I do it now rather than in committee stage, because I would like to see the government bring in some of these amendments in committee stage rather than wait for the hon. Opposition members to do so.

Section 7, subsection 3 says, and I am beginning in the middle: "It shall recommend to the Director the course that ought to be taken with respect to the complaint which may include reinstatement with or without compensation for loss of earnings and other benefits." I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that he add in that section after the word "include" the following words: "hiring, up-grading," and then continue "reinstatement". I think the reason for this addition is obvious. A person may make the complaint when he fails to get employment. The Bill should make it possible for him to be hired - that after the director or the conciliator, or the commission will have investigated and found that he was unjustly denied a job, they should have the power to say that he be hired. The words "hiring" and "up-grading" should be included and not merely say "reinstatement". At present it limits it to a person who had been fired or discharged. It should apply to the person applying for a job and also to a person who may lose the up-grading benefits because he was absent. Nor do I think that the Bill should contain the words "without compensation". I think if he is

reinstated it should be with compensation, and the word "without" should be dropped. I very respectfully submit the suggestion to the government. I think it is an amendment which the government should introduce when the Bill comes down.

With respect to the section dealing with penalties. I have already stated that the law will not, by itself, accomplish the purpose which we all set for ourselves, but, nevertheless, once we do enact the law, I think there should be some teeth in it. I suggest that the government see the need for increasing the penalty. The Bill which stands in my name provides for a penalty of $100. in the case of an individual and up to $500. in the case of a second offence, also a stiffer penalty, a jail term -- either or both-- if the violation is a persistent one -- and the guilty party refuses to change. I think that section should be amended.

With respect to section 10 I cannot for the world agree with the argumentation of the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder), and I cannot agree with the section. What is wrong with this section is this: That, as it is worded--and it is in the Bill---it casts a suspicion and presumes guilt of an entire group, whether it is a racial, a national or a religious group. In other words, what the government was evidently concerned with, was the emergency which may arise in time of war. Is that not right? That is quite clear in the Bill.

AN hon. MEMBER: The emergency which is here now.

MR. SALSBERG: All right; the emergency which is here now; the cold war. I think it is in principle

wrong to imply that an entire group may be guilty. An individual of that group, whether it be a religious or national group, may be guilty, but the way it is worded you assume that an entire group may be guilty. The employer will exercise the right to determine. Here is a case which occurred in the last war. We were at war with Imperialist Japan. It would have been wrong to say that every Japanese in this country was unreliable, could be discharged and then defended on the ground that, well, he is of Japanese parentage. It would have been wrong. That is true of every other group. I say further that undoubtedly, if the need should arise, the Federal Government will enact legislation which will take care of such emergencies. This section does cast an aspersion on an entire group and is wrong in that it leaves to the employer the right to decide whether he will refuse employment to a Japanese, a negro, a Jew, a Ukrainian, a Catholic or a Protestant, or a Russian, because he considers the whole group guilty. This is wrong.

In conclusion I would like to make a few suggestions to the government in the hope that the government will give them careful consideration. Some of the suggestions, I am about to make, may make it unnecessary to have the amendment which is before us. There is a lot of truth in what the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) says about the lack of the machinery and the setup which is being created in the Bill.

I suggest to the government that it consider adding to the Bill, and I think all the opposition groups

agree on this, no discrimination against a person because of sex. I agree with that. There should be no discrimination because of national origin, religion, etc., or sex. I would go further and say "or for political beliefs".

MR. FROST: Did you have "sex" in your Bill?

MR. SALSBERG: I do not think so. That is right, I have not, but I agree it should be in. I think, since you asked, you should also agree that it be included. It is not an extreme proposal when so conservative a newspaper as the Globe & Mail argues for it editorially time and again. I think it is safe to recommend that.

I would also include political opinions, so that no worker can be denied the right to work because of the political belief he holds or the political affiliation he holds. I think that should be in a Bill of this sort. Whether or not the government will include those points, I do sincerely urge the government to accept the following ones. I think the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) will see the importance of them. I would appreciate it if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would give this a moment of attention.

I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that the Bill provide for the setting up of a voluntary---what I mean is, unpaid---FEP Board on a provincial level; in other words, that the government provide legislation for the setting up of a Board of representative and interested people who will not only help the Director but will carry on the necessary educational work, public work, to reduce all forms of

discrimination to the minimum. The Bill does not provide for any such apparatus now. I think the government should agree to provide for such a Board. The government emphasizes, time and again, the need for education among the people. That is correct. Let us set up an apparatus which will do that. A voluntary board of that sort will undoubtedly make an important contribution.

The second recommendation is: That similar voluntary boards be set up on the municipal and regional level. I think that a committee of this sort could make an important contribution in the fight against discrimination in such centres as Hamilton, and other large areas in the province. I think there are democratic-minded, public spirited, people who will gladly serve on such boards and will, on the local level, carry forward the work which the provincial board will indicate and perhaps direct.

The third recommendation is: That the Bill provide for the displaying of the essentail sections of this Bill in all employment offices, in factories and shops, as is the case with minimum wage laws and regulations. After all, we want the law to be known. I think the Bill should be amended to provide for the printing of the Act or at least the essential sections of it, so that every employment office displays it prominently, so that every employer has one in his own factory, and have it become known from one end of the province to the other.

These are not outlandish proposals. I think they are practical, I think they are reasonable and I

think the government should consider them. If they are prepared to make a statement on them now, well and good; if not, let them consider it between the second reading and the time the Bill comes into the Committee stage.

In concluding, having made these recommendations, I would say again that the Bill is a great step forward. Certainly I would like to see it strengthened in many ways, some of the ways I have indicated. Others will undoubtedly have other suggestions to make. There are many other improvements upon which I did not touch because I did not think they would for a moment be entertained. Those I have suggested are so obviously necessary and reasonable that I hope the government will consider them. But, whether the government will incorporate all of the changes suggested, or whether the government will not, we will vote for and welcome the Bill as a beginning and a reasonably fair beginning to place on the statute books of this province legislation which will help in the broad campaign to remove discriminatory practises in the field of employment and which will guarantee equality of opportunity, which should be the right of every person who lives among us.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WALTERS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) made a statement in the early part of his speech in which he stated that, in speaking to this Bill, I stated I was happy to welcome this Bill. I am not quite that inconsistent. What I did say, for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), is that I was happy the government had

introduced Bill 121, Fair Employment Practises Act, because it vindicated the opinions and views long held by this group. The hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) can check that in Hansard.

MR. SALSBERG: What I said was not critical; it was merely--

MR. JOLLIFFE: Just twisting it.

MR. SALSBERG: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) should not judge everyone by his own methods. I had no intention of twisting. Somebody very close said that.

AN hon. MEMBER: I did not say that.

MR. SALSBERG: I am glad you did not say that, but somebody did.

MISS A.MACPHAIL (York East): Mr. Speaker, I only want to deal with one point, that is, the fact discrimination against sex has been omitted from the Bill. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) really is going to need all his suavity and oratory to get out of this hole. It is going to be interesting to see how he does it. There is to be no discrimination against race, creed, color, no matter what color, nationality, ancestry or place of origin.

MR. FROST: Might I ask the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) if that, sex, was in the Bill sponsored by her side?

MISS MACPHAIL: I do not carry the responsibility of the Bills sponsored on our side.

Yesterday, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) introduced a Bill which he wanted us to think gave women equality, so he did not need to put sex in this Bill.

Had he put sex in this Bill I would have believed that he was sincere. I want to believe that he is sincere. I want to believe in the integrity of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) but he makes it difficult for me.

Yesterday the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) introduced this Bill and we had a long debate on it, an Act to ensure fair remuneration to female employees. I want to be kind but I think it is pretence at equity I think it is a pretence. I do not think it is going to bring equity. Now, to-day we have a Fair Employment Practises Act wh. .h gives everybody else equity but does not give equity to women. What are the women to think? I agree wit. .hese things; anybody of any creed, anybody of any color, anybody of any nationality, anybody of any ancestry or anybody of any religion, so long as they are male will get equal treatment, but, if it is a woman involved, even if her ancestry is strictly Canadian, she has been here all her life and her family for generations, she can be discriminated against. I protest most vigorously. Yesterday I did not agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and this Bill to-day is proof that I was right in not agreeing with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

I want to quote. I do not expect the government is going to change the Bill; I know them too well to expect it but I want to quote the universal declaration of human rights. This is the article to which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made reference and this declaration was issued on December 10, 1948. I am quoting article number 2:

> "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration without discretion of any kind such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

That just about covers everything. This declaration of human rights admits that women are human and they have equal rights with all other members of the human family.

Now, there are times, I notice, that the Globe & Mail does not entirely agree with the government. I do not know what that means and this is one question on which the Globe & Mail disagrees, not inserting the word "sex" in the Fair Employment Practises Bill. I quote from the Globe & Mail of Tuesday, February 27, 1951:

> "There is a significant omission in the types of discrimination to which the Act will apply. The word 'sex' should undoubtedly be added to the list quoted above. If it is essential that a declaration of tolerance be made, it should most definitely include the

most widespread form of discrimination between individuals and employers. The Act states that there shall be no discrimination against an employee with regard to any term or condition of employment. In the case of virtually all women employees, however, discrimination is common in terms of remuneration. Women are regularly paid less than men doing the same work. The omission of this element of discrimination disregards a major part of the problem which the Bill seeks to overcome. Is the government sincere in this matter or is it content to deal with merely part of the issue? There is far more active discrimination against the female minority in business and industry than against all the other types of minorities specified in the Bill."

Women are discriminated against not only in the matter of pay but in the matter of promotion. I just draw to your attention the fact that roughly two-thirds of the teachers are women but the principals of all the schools are men. Now, why does anybody suppose that only men can be principals of schools? It is just a clear case of discrimination. One of the masters in one of the normal schools - I will keep him from getting into trouble if I can; he did not say it to me anyway - he said to a group of very fine students, in speaking of his school: "My grade A men teachers are equal to grade B women teachers", and that was this year. He said: "We get top notch women in the teaching profession,

we do not get topnotch men." Well, if that is a fact, then I say why is it that all the principals of schools are male? That is just discrimination and one could quote many, many instances of discrimination on the basis of sex and sex alone. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) must admit that the omission of the word "sex" from his Bill puts women in a different category from the other members of the human family and this has gone on over the centuries. It has a psychological effect. This is putting women as a second type of citizen, even a third or fourth type. We are getting now up to second, we are coming up.

MR. PORTER: I thought you were first for a long time.

MR. FROST: She is, too.

MISS MacPHAIL: But it has a great psychological effect on women that they are not considered equal to other members of the human family. Everybody needs to be felt that they belong and women need that too; they need to feel they belong, that they are equal to anyone else in the human family, that they are as important as anyone else. That is human need; it is not a female need more than a male need. When you think of how women go spending a lifetime bolstering the egos of men, it is about time it is recognized that women have egos too. I have heard a great many men, men in this House, men in this group, criticize women because they do not carry the responsibilities that have been conferred on them, the privilege of voting and so on. No wonder, when, for centuries, women were less than,

far less than, equal. They were supposed to have almost no sense. You do not obtain these things suddenly, you get them gradually and when sex comes into the Fair Employment Practises Act, we can expect women to carry a great deal more responsibility than they are carrying today. I want to say in closing, to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) again, that it will be interesting to watch the eloquence and suavity which he will have to employ to get out of this fix and to butter up the women of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate because I have had something to do with this sort of thing and I am a little disappointed--

MR. FROST: If you are only a little disappointed, that is all right.

MR. WISMER: I would not like to think a Tory could greatly disappoint me but I am a little disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the Bill itself, in the way it is drawn and I am disappointed that the government apparently does not understand the problem which the Bill seeks to alleviate. While the Bill establishes a principle, it shows in its wording and its sections a complete lack of understanding on the part of the government or any idea of what is going on in the matter of discrimination in employment. That is why I am prepared to support the amendment by the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Walters) because this Bill - I do not want to say it is a pious statement on the part of the government, I would rather like to think that the government is quite serious in what it is doing - my

disappointment is in the fact that apparently the government does not know and has no grasp of what the real problems are in discrimination in employment or how to handle discrimination in employment, Mr. Speaker. Those who have had a good deal of experience in these matters will be able to see that it is a two-part affair. First, you have to deal with the individual case, where the individual is discriminated against because he happens to be associated with a religious group, a national group, or a colour group. But, you also have to deal with a general attitude. After all, the problem of discrimination as it affects individuals is, at the same time, a problem of a general attitude in the community which, really, Mr. Speaker, brings us to a more basic problem. Unless this legislation is sufficiently amended to get somewhere near the basic problem, it will not be something to which you can point in the future as a great advance. It will be rather something that you will look back on and say: "How could people have made that mistake however anxious they were to do the right thing?" The basic problem falls into two parts also. You have, on the one hand - I would like to make this as clear as I can make it - discrimination. Now, "discrimination" as I understand it, is an act, something you do, something which one man or an organization does to another man; it is an injury inflicted upon another. Naturally, that is something which exists and is specific and can be dealt with specifically. But there is also involved in that something rather different which is prejudice itself. We say the community

may be prejudiced against a group in the community. Well, as an example, Mr. Speaker, we have heard here a lot about anti-Semitism; that is, prejudice of the community against a group of Semitic people. Basically, why would you have anti-Semitism? I am quite aware, Mr. Speaker, if you read literature on the subject you will find many reasons have been given, but I submit there is only one reason for anti-Semitism and, in stating the reason for anti-Semitism, you state the reason for all prejudices in all forms and that is ignorance - pure and simple ignorance. I am satisfied that the Gentile people could not possibly be prejudiced against them and would not be anti-Semitic if they understood the Jewish beliefs. It may be they dislike something they do as anyone may dislike something that another man does, whatever his religion, whatever his group, whatever the name of his grandfather, but, if you understand the other person, if you know something about him and his group, you cannot be prejudiced against him. I also submit, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot discriminate against a man if you are not prejudiced against him.

I do not wish to proceed at great length. Others have indicated that these prejudices and the acts of discrimination have very far-reaching social and economic effects. The act of discrimination itself - in keeping a man from a job however much he should be equipped for it - involves a loss of earnings. To expand that, the prejudice that exists today in this country against the Negro means that all Negroes, almost to a man and woman, suffer loss of earnings. They also suffer something I think much worse and that

is loss of opportunity. You or I, as white people, people who do not think in terms of what colour our skin happens to be, forget, I think, that there is a prejudice in the minds of the people of this province. This was drawn to my attention when speaking to the general manager of one of the large financial institutions in the city of Toronto. That great corporation was interviewed as to whether the corporation discriminated against anyone in employment. He said: "Oh, I do not think so." He was asked: "Do you discriminate against Negroes?" and he said; "Oh, no, no". "Well, have you any Negroes on your staff, have you any Negro stenographers, accountants, clerks?" "Oh, no." "Well, is it not rather peculiar, if you do not discriminate against Negroes, there should be none on your staff?" "Oh, we have a Negro janitor." In the mind of that employer, that was not discrimination. Out of that loss of opportunity comes insecurity and that is just the same, Mr. Speaker, a partial paralysis of the system, one poor leg and a crutch to walk on. With that comes something that is very deep in the community, very deep psychologically, because with the acceptance by a group, such as the Negroes, of the idea that he may not have the same opportunity and may not be granted the same opportunity in the community as white people, he says to himself: "I cannot do anything about it." I know that in this city, Mr. Speaker, Negro parents tell their Negro children that it is not worth while having an education because they will not get any employment commensurate with it. That is the effect in the community of prejudice and discrimination and this legis-

lation misses the point completely. It is when people begin to think that little can be done; that as a group in the community they are not wanted, that if you happen to be a member of that group, you cannot get the sort of employment for which you are qualified. These people are open to a much worse influence - they are open to the influence which seeks a scapegoat, they are open to the work of a hatemonger and the schisms that could have been healed in that community are widened out. There are those in this world who still believe that it is good political practise to divide and rule and such things assist them. So, we have to get at two things. We have to get at discrimination itself, the actual act of injury, but we also have to get at the thing that makes discrimination possible, which is prejudice and is ignorance.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

Therefore, the remedy which should be in this Bill, is not in, Mr. Speaker, as legislation to deal with discriminations, for that is all the legislation can deal with. But also in the legislation there should be a provision for education, because that is the only way to deal with the prejudices, and to eradicate ignorance, and it surprises me -- I do not think the correct word is "surprise"; now that I have heard Milton read, I should use the word "astonish", -- it astonishes me that the Tory government shouod argue for years against our Bills with a provision for education, and then bring down a Bill with no educational provision in it whatever.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WISMER: Well, I have got the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) agreeing with me.

It has no provision for educating the public generally about prejudice, about the lack of need for prejudice, and more particularly to create a general atmosphere in the province of Ontario in which people will live, and work, and employ, and be employed, with the feeling that discrimination and prejudice is wrong, in order to break down the need for conciliation procedure not to say that a discriminatory Act will not take place. If we had that sort of thing, you would have a gradually changing attitude on the part of the employers and on the part of employees, which would gradually remove discriminatory actions from our province.

I would like to go one step further in dealing with discrimination itself. It has been suggested that the procedure under this Act is not too satisfactory.

Well, the procedure under the Act is not satisfactory, from my personal point of view, for the reason that it does not understand what problem it is trying to work out. It just does not understand it.

Let me point out to the hon. Minister (Mr.Daley) Mr. Speaker, that there are two parts of the problem keeping out discrimination itself. First, there is the act of discrimination. Someone is refused employment, and a complaint can be made, and that can be conciliated, and that is more or less handled in the Bill; that particular situation is more or less handled in the Bill.

But let me advise the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) of something which goes on more in this province than that which represents a very large part of the field of discrimination, about which I can find nothing in the Bill, and that is to break down the general employment policy of the corporations, and change it around. Not to fight with the corporations, but through educational effort privately to persuade and convince the large employers that this type of employment policy is wrong.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may say that is impossible. I would like the hon. members of the House to know that that sort of thing is now going on. We are now busily engaged in that work, and the policies of some of the corporations have been changed.

The hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) laughed, because he has not heard anything about this sort of thing. He sits in an ivory tower over the way, and does not know what is going on, and his staff is too small to find things out for him.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry;,I did not laugh. I merely answered a remark made to me here. I was not referring to anything the hon. member (Mr. Wismer) said.

MR. WISMER: You will never break down discrimination in employment by punitive measures; you will never break down discrimination in employment by conciliation of individual cases -- never. But you can break down discrimination in employment by a continuous process, publicly creating an atmosphere of tolerance, and privately by persuasion.

I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) to know this private effort has been going on for some years, and policies have been changed, and have been changed in the most amazing places. There is nothing in this Bill to encourage that work; nothing in this Bill to create an authority whereby a few dollars of public money can be expended in that kind of work, which would make this a better province, in which decent people can live.

We are privately trying at the moment to get one of the great educational institution to undertake a research project. Frankly, that is another disappointment to me, Mr. Speaker, that the government did not suggest somewhere in this Bill some assistance to universities or other types of institutions, for work of that kind. If we are to make this great forward step, let us go at it in an orderly, manly way. Perhaps what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the government has been trying too hard to keep up with the CCF opposition, and it stumbled in its hurry.

I would like to read from the Timmins Daily Press, of Saturday, March 3rd, 1951, as follows:

> "While the CCF. have never been in power in the province, they still have exercised in some directions almost as important an influence as the parties that have been in."

These are not my words, Mr. Speaker, but those of the Timmins Daily Press, of Saturday, March 3rd,1951.

It goes on:

> "What brings this to mind is the Fair Employment Practices Act.
>
> There is little doubt that though the government proposed this legislation, the entire credit goes to the C.C.F.
>
> If it had not been for the opposition strenuously advocating legislation against discrimination in employment for color, creed, etc., it is most unlikely any government would have introduced such a Bill.
>
> There is no doubt the majority of the government members by sentiment would favor legislation against discriminatory pracrice, but without a strong push they wouldn't take such an advanced step."

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Who said that?

MR. WISMER: I am quoting from The Timmins Daily Press, of Saturday, March 3rd, 1951.

MR. FROST: Amazing.

MR. WISMER: And this goes on:

" As Mr. Frost said only a year ago, in turning down a similar bill, he didn't think it was wise to act far in advance of public opinion. And without a C.C.F. group agitating for it, it probably would have been a long time before there would have been enough "public opinion" to warrant it.

And there is a lot of other legislation on the books for which the C.C.F. influence, since it first arrived in the house in strength in 1943, must be given indirect credit.

The Civil Liberties Act of the early days of the Drew administration is just one other example.

In other ways also the C.C.F.-ers have made a distinct contribution to the affairs of the province."

MR. FROST: Pat yourselves on the back. You will need it.

MR. WISMER: Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am concerned about these deficiencies in the Bill, but not from a political standpoint. I am sure there a re many hon. members opposite who cannot understand a remark like that, but perhaps they will understand it when I go one or two sentences further. This is outside the Bill of Rights enacted in Saskatchewan in 1945. This is the only legislation of this type in the Cominion of Canada, a Fair

Employment Practices Act, separate and distinct.

The whole labor movement and many organizations, Civil Liberties Associations, minority groups, and others, have got into a mood of considerable co-operation in an endeavour to obtain this type of legislation on the statute books of all the provinces.

I say this to the government, and especially to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), that you are not assisting us by this legislation. You do not give us a model we can take to Newfoundland, and British Columbia, to Alberta, Quebec and Nova Scotia, yes, even to the Dominion of Canada -- because it has labour jurisdiction too -- but you give us something, and say, "Of course, it is not a very good Bill; if you change it around, we will have something." I say give us a model with which we can go out and do a job throughout the country. Put this into shape so we can do a real job, and do it in the way it should be done, and as the people who are doing it know it can be done. Make it effective, and we will support it, and take your Bill up and down this country, and get it into every jurisdiction, in order that we will have what we stand for, and that is that the rights and privileges shall extend to all people, not to a group, but to all. Give us not lip service, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) but give us the full load.

MR. FROST: Are you going to vote for it?

MR. WISMER: After you amend it, I certainly will vote for it.

MR. FROST: Are you going to vote for it now?

MR. WISMER: It certainly will pain me greatly to have to.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WISMER: My compulsion, Mr. Speaker, comes from a conscience, a compulsion which is rather different, than the hand clapping I heard just now. The people who have been involved in this work, and the people who are now involved in this work, are not politicians, but people who are doing this work because they believe in democracy, and because they believe that all rights should extend to all people.

You give them a feeling that perhaps a new principle is to be enunciated in the province of Ontario and yet in the working of the Act you destroy their hopes, and interfere with their work.

What I ask for is a Bill which takes into account the practical problem, not just the principle. Sure, we can all agree with the principle, but it is a principle which will fall into the discard, from the fact that the machinery will make it impossible to work.

I think these are considerations of great worth, and of great value. I am really disappointed that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) did not consult with the people who are actually working in this field in the province of Ontario, right here in the city of Toronto, before the Bill was drafted. He could have found out from those people who are doing that work today what is going on, how they handle this problem, what a job it is, and what successes they have achieved, and what future successes they hope to achieve. Did you have to go all the way to the state of New York to find out about these things? They have a Bill there, and it is

a good model. Unfortunately this Act is not modeled from their Act, or if it is, the results are far from being a model, so far, that it is hard to distinguish the similarity. You could have consulted people who are working right here in the city of Toronto, and working successfully.

Hon. GEORGE DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Are they not working on it in Ottawa?

MR. WISMER: Who?

MR. DUNBAR: The Labour Organizations?

MR. WISMER: That is far off. As far as this is concerned, there are many people who are working at it outside of the Labour movement, and it is a disappointment to the people directly involved that they were not thought worth being consulted by the government of Ontario, and I think it was a great failure on the part of the government not to consult with these people.

MR. G.T.GORDON (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to prolong the debate, and much of what I was going to say has been fully covered by the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg).

MR. FROST: Why do you not join him?

MR. GORDON: I, like him, was once discriminated against. When I first came from Britain to seek employment in the city of Brantford, I was faced with a sign, "No Englishmen need apply".

MR. FROST: Oh, you did not do too badly.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St.David): I thought you came from Ireland.

MR. GORDON: I happened to be born in Ireland,

but my Father was Scotch and my Mother English, and I lived in England most of my life until I cameto Canada.

In those days we were called "bronchos", sometimes "chirpers"; the Italians were called "wops", the Hungarians were called "Hunkies" and the Polish people were called "Pollacks". However, I am glad to say that today ,ost of that is gone. We do not hear as much of it as we used to.

In our City we had a Negro Minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. His congregatioh was not very large, and he had difficulty with the financing, he had a family, and had to get a job. He was a well-educated man, well qualified, of nice personality, but the only job that poor chap could get was that of a janitor in one of the main stores on the main street. He did not want people to know he was doing that kind of work, so he would go early in the morning and wash the windows, and then go late at night and finish up all that kind of work.

I hope this Bill will do away with all that kind of thing. While the Bill does not go as far as we expected it to go, it is certainly a step in the right direction.

MR. DUNBAR: I have two stores, and I would have taken that man and given him employment.

MR. GORDON: As a janitor?

MR. DUNBAR: No, right in the store, and given him employment.

(TAKE "G" FOLLOWS)

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there are some very unusual features of this legislation to which I want to refer. My starting point is that the principle which has been embodied in this Bill and in previous Bills sponsored in this House by both the government and by private Members, is a principle which has gained not only wide support but wider support in recent years. It was on that basis in 1944 that it became possible for the government to introduce the Racial Discrimination Act of that year which had the support of all parties and, since reference has previously been made to that Bill, I would like to remind the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of what actually happened. The Bill was introduced by the government, and for that deed, of course, the government deserves full credit. Immediately after it was introduced it encountered substantial opposition not within this House but without this House, and not so much from people who had read the B ill and who understood it, but largely from people who had not read the Bill or who completely misapprehended its nature. For some time the House heard nothing further of that Bill, and saw nothing further of it. Then, however, it became apparent that this was not a matter on which partisan differences existed in the Twenty-first Legislature. That became perfectly apparent. It was made clear on the day when that Bill reached second reading, when it was supported in succession by the hon. Prime Minister who was at that time Mr. Drew, by myself, by the hon. member for Grey, South (Mr. Oliver) I believe, who spoke on behalf of the Liberal Party and by the hon. member for

Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). As I recall it that Bill was passed by the House without dissent, unless my memory misleads me. It was on that occasion that Mr. Drew rose above the level of partisan controversy and made what I considered to be one --

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): I was a member of that administration and there never was any thought of withdrawing that Bill. It was in the Speech from the Throne, the Bill was introduced. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is just drawing on his imagination to think that, --

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would listen a little closer to what I have to say he would not misunderstand me. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is misunderstanding me now. I know whereof I speak and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should not pretend that I do not. I do know, for example, and I will not go into all the particulars, because I have no intention of violating any confidence given me either by an hon. member of this House of either side, or by an hon. member of the government, the fact is that after the Bill was introduced it was bitterly criticized by one of the most important press supporters of the government, which I am happy to say was subsequently changed to some extent.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): That is all to the credit of the government.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I have already said that the government of that day deserves full credit for introducing the B ill. Also, the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), if he would listen more carefully to what I have to say,

would be in a position to disagree, if he desires to disagree, with what I have to say. The remarks the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter), and the remarks the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) have just made indicate that, like now, the criticism of those who criticized the Bill of 1944 was based on misapprehension and misunderstanding and on ignorance rather than understanding.

As we have perceived since 1944, there has been growing support of the same principle. As the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) pointed out on a previous occasion, the people of this country expressed their view about fair employment practices legislation in a Gallup Poll. It was overwhelmingly in favour of the principle. We have further had the declaration of the United Nations, the declaration of universal human rights.

What I am about to suggest to the government is that where you have disagreement on principles in legislation there is frequently no point in referring the matter to any committee for further study. If, for example, the government were introducing a Bill to which we were opposed in principle, one would hardly expect the B ill to make much progress or to be improved substantially in committee; but, on the other hand, where there is general agreement, if not unanimous agreement, on the principle of the thing, then almost any Bill is capable of improvement. I do not think the government is going to argue that this Bill or any other Bill of the same character cannot be improved. It was indicated that there was room for improvement when a previous Bill was introduced and later withdrawn so that its place

might be taken by Bill No. 121.

I might say that this, of course, is not the only jurisdiction in which civil rights legislation is on the agenda. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) acknowledged the leadership which has been given by the United States. The civil rights question has been high on the agenda in that country for a good many years. I refer now to Congress and the presidency. President Roosevelt did his best to get a civil rights programme through Congress without complete success. President Truman has given courageous leadership to the same end. Indeed, one of the issues of the 1948 presidential election in the United States was a civil rights programme, for which President Truman took a strong stand, as did his party convention, and it was upon that issue that Truman had to run the gauntlet as between a dissident group in the Southern States and the candidate of the Republican party. Mr. Truman was re-elected on a programme which included the enactment of civil rights legislation. That legislation, Mr. Speaker, has been frustrated in the Congress of the United States very largely by delaying tactics in committee and in Congress.

MR. FROST: That is why we do not want this Bill to get into Committee.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am sorry the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) takes such a captious view of the matter. I think it is unworthy of him and it is unworthy of the level on which a matter of this kind ought to be discussed. And that is why I want to acknowledge the very high level upon which Mr. Drew addressed himself to this question in 1944.

What I am suggesting is that where you have agreement on principle there need be no fear of captious opposition or delay in committee. On the contrary, one could only expect improvement.

I may say that, when I was in Washington a year or so ago, I visited the gallery of the Senate. There was no room for me on the floor. I listened to a debate in which Senator Langer spoke at great length. The Bill under discussion was civil rights Bill, which, as far as I know, has never reached a vote. There were many references to the fact that this question had never been permitted to reach a vote. I listened to Senator Langer spend most of the afternoon, in connection with the civil rights Bill, which he professed to favour, discussing the margarine question. I think we can be certain that if this Bill were to be discussed in committee no such delay could be expected, that no one would discuss the margarine question or attempt to do so while the Bill is under consideration.

There is another aspect of the matter to which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) made passing reference. I think it is vital, and I think that as we accept it we must go even further this year, or next year, or the year after, than we do in this Bill. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) referred to some of the great issues which divide the world today. There is no doubt that racial discrimination is a key factor in that division. He acknowledged the leadership which the United States has given in legislation of this kind. I would like to

acknowledge also the leadership which has been given by the United Kingdom, by its people and by its government. After all, it was the United Kingdom which gave the initial leadership towards abolition of the institution of chattel slavery.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

That was an institution which operated not entirely but very largely at the expense of coloured and other underprivileged people, and it is to the British people that we must give credit for leadership in the movement to abolish chattel slavery. And to the British people also we must give credit for that great act of statesmanship four or five years ago by which their Imperial rule over India, Burma and Ceylon was voluntarily relinquished, and over Pakistan, and they were invited and welcomed into the family of the British Commonweath of Nations on a footing of equality, on a footing of self-government and equality with the other nations of the Commonwealth. I say that this great act of statesmanship removed one of the principal obstacles to a better understanding between the coloured people of the East and the nations which inhabit the western hemisphere.

I am sure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would wish to give full acknowledgement to the British people for that great act of statesmanship, but there remains, Mr. Speaker, a widespread and fully justified feeling among the people of the eastern world and the people of Africa and the coloured peoples of this hemisphere that the white man persistently and continuously disregard the rights as human beings of people who have a skin of different colour.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the Achilles heel of the western nations. This is their most vulnerable point. This where the appeal of Communism to the peoples of Asia and Africa is most effective, and I therefore suggest that nothing could be more important to our future and the future of our coloured fellow-

men than the enactment of legislation which, by education, by enforcement and by example will accord to them the same rights that are enjoyed by other citizens.

I want to add a further word on a question which has not been discussed in this debate - and I am not criticizing the government in this regard. I draw attention to this question because I want it given consideration. I know that a Fair Employment Practises Bill relates to a certain field of activity, the field of employment, the relationship of the employer and the employee, and, therefore, I am not disposed to find fault with the government for failing to include other matters within the scope of this Bill, but I feel that consideration ought to be given to these other phases, particularly if the government were to see its way clear to undertake an educational program. Like the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer), I am a little baffled with a government,which, in previous years, has pointed to the need for education rather than legislation, and should be so disinterested at this time in the question of education towards putting an end to racial discrimination. But, of course, if we have an educational programme, if education were provided for in this Bill, the effect of that educational work would extend beyond the field of employment.

I am sure, for example, that it would assist in putting an end to the discrimination which exists in the case of restaurants, hotels and other places. I must say I agree in part with what was said in previous years about the importance of education and the matter of denying certain people service in hotels, restaurants,

theatres and elsewhere, which is a very serious one which may have been mentioned during this debate but, if it was mentioned, it escaped me.

There is a very famous story, Mr. Speaker, which appeared some years ago in a magazine known as The New Yorker. This is a good example of the English language at its best, which I give to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) as being one that might well be included in some of our school readers of Ontario. This short story, written by Robert McLaughlin, in which I think hon. members of this House would find much of interest, relates to a simple incident in a southern town in the year 1944. It is called "A Short Wait Between Trains". I am not going to read it to the House, as I might well do, but I just want to tell the House how clearly a little incident of this kind illustrates the ironies and sometimes the tragedies which follow from the practice of racial discrimination.

In this story, Mr. Speaker, three coloured soldiers on way from one camp to another find it necessary to change trains in the southern part of the eastern United States, and they have a short wait between trains, from ten o'clock in the morning until one in the afternoon. In that period they want to get something to eat, so they descend from the train on which they arrived and they ask a coloured baggageman, "Where in this place can we get something to eat? We've had nothing this morning and our train doesn't go till one o'clock". So the coloured baggageman informs them that: "In this place you can't get anything to eat - you'll have to walk three or four miles to the next town". While

they are waiting on the platform and debating what they should do, they notice a crowd of local citizenry collected in curiosity around another group of soldiers on the platform. The other group are white men and they wear the insignia of prisoners of war and are escorted by two soldiers of the United States Army. After looking their full at these men whose kind they will one day meet in combat, the three American soldiers decide to enter the station restaurant in the hope that they may persuade the people in the station restaurant to give them something to eat. And they do, led by one man from the north who is a little more courageous than the others. The cashier, lowering her voice, tells them they cannot be served in the restaurant but if they will step around to the kitchen no doubt the chef will get them a sandwich. So they retire in disorder from the restaurant and, going by the back way, they enter the kitchen where the coloured chef and a coloured girl prepare coffee and sandwiches for these three soldiers of the United States. While they are waiting for the sandwiches, one of them glances through an aperture into the main restaurant and there he sees 20 German prisoners of war seated at the tables in the main restaurant, seated at their ease, rolling their cigarettes, eating their bacon and eggs, while one guard stands at the door and the other by the casher's desk. And the three soldiers of the United States, who are not good enough to eat in the restaurant but who have to find their sustenance in the kitchen, stand with their mouths open watching their enemies - their prisoners of war - being entertained,with all the comforts of other

citizens, in the main restaurant.

And that, Mr. Speaker, is the end of the story. But it should not be the end of the story as far as this Legislature is concerned. This Legislature has a responsibility to assure to all citizens of this province the right of equal access to places that serve the public; places that serve the public for gain have no right or title in our democracy to deny to any person, because of race, creed or place of origin, the service which is offered to the public in that place of business.

Now, as I say, I am not finding fault with the government for limiting the application of this Bill to the field of employment, because I think the field of employment does require a special approach, but I do suggest that if there were provision for education in this Bill that the educational work done might go a long way towards removing other forms of discrimination which are openly practised in this province. I do not propose to name names or to single out any particular place for reference, because I think that the guilt which is to be assigned in this matter is the responsibility of all the people of Ontario, of all of us, and there is nothing to be gained by singling out any particular place for special reference. But it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, known to all hon. members of this House, that there are places catering to the public in Ontario where, with the apparent approbation of the local authorities, service is denied to certain groups of people. That is inconsistent with the democracy we attempt to practise and inconsistent with everything which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has said today

in connection with this Bill, and on former occasions.

I know that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) himself would be the first to disagree with a practice of that kind, because it is,after all, not only inconsistent with the principles we state today but it is also inconsistent with the traditions and the background of this province. It is inconsistent with the teachings of Christianity and this province was pioneered in the first place very largely by people of the Christian religion.

I must add before I conclude here today that not only was this province pioneered by people who were affiliated with churches of the Christian faith under which it is declared that all men are brothers, not only that, but this province was also pioneered and has been built very largely by people who sought refuge from other lands where they did not receive equal treatment with all others. And it continued to grow and develop on that basis, Mr. Speaker. I hope the government has this in mind - I know that we have on this side of the House - but as we grow and develop, we should be welcoming to this province many people of diverse origins. We will become not a society of uniformity, we will become a society in which there will be many different kinds of people, and I for one believe that that is all to the good. I think that this place will prosper and will develop much better if we have many different kinds of people, if we are not all cast in the same mold, or on the same pattern.

We look forward today to the growth of Ontario and, as we do, I think it is incumbent upon us to make this

place a democratic society in which strangers will be welcomed and in which they will find their place without discrimination of any kind. I cannot think of anything we can do to make more certain that they will become good citizens in our midst than the steps we take to provide that their should be no discrimination against them.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to give full marks to the government for accepting at this time the principle that some of us have advocated for a long time and I am not going to make the partisan criticism that they have just accepted this principle this year. I am quite prepared to concede that the principle has been accepted for some years past and that the government, if the government has not gone quite as far as we would have liked them to go, I am prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt and concede that they may have had reasons which appared to them to be sufficiently good and reasonable. Perhaps in the words of Cardinal Newman, it was a case of "One step enough for me", or one step at a time.

I do not mind that very much, if I could be certain there would be further steps taken in the future, and I hope there will be, no matter who sits on the government side and who sits on the opposition side. The principle of non-discrimination is in the Bill; it is a principle on which we all agree and that, Mr. Speaker, is the reason why we feel that, being in agreement on the principle, we should not be afraid to attempt improvements and perhaps changes in the machinery devised to enforce the principle or to make the principle effective. If the government were to do that, I would be even better convinced that they are indeed loyal to the principle to

which they subscribe.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise to close the debate in connection with this Bill under a deep burden of disappointment, because I thought that finally we had introduced a Bill here which would meet with the unanimous and enthusiastic support of the Opposition. But again, once again, Mr. Speaker, I am doomed to disappointment and I may say, despite the fact that this arises so often with the Opposition, that nevertheless I am not hardened. I still have hopes that there may be an occasion arise when the Opposition will see the error of their ways and will support in an enthusiastic way the legislation of this government.

Mr. Speaker, you know I can hardly even say this; there is a sort of a grudging approval given on the other side to this Bill. One of the great Toronto dailies here, which does not always support this government, referred not long ago to--

MISS AGNES MacPHAIL (York East): The Star?

MR. FROST: --the historic measure which this Bill is and commended it to the people, spoke about the great preamble as "a noble statement", and this Bill, which has been so widely commended by the leaders in church and State across Ontario and across Canada, it is indeed a great disappointment to me and to hon. members over here to hear the very grudging approval which is given by the other side. One would almost think that they were opposed to this principle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know that I never like to engage in anything which is a matter of acrimony, or

anything of that sort. I think that I do avoid matters political on most occasions and keep free from things of that sort but what has been said from the other side this afternoon moves me to say this. I listened to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). He, at one moment, said: "This is a great move --", and so on, but then he quoted Cardinal Newman, "one step enough for me", and he rather inferred that the government and the party of which this government is composed has been slow in matters of this sort.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take my hon. friend for a ride for awhile and tell him a few things, because they must sit over there in an attitude of despair, blank despair all the time, and they do not see what is taking place in this great land of ours.

This party of which this government is representative gave to the people of this province, and gave to the Dominion of Canada, votes for women. The party of which this government is representative passed a law which enabled a great reform to take place, namely, that the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) would be able to sit in this House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I would say that was a reform made possible by, not the C.C.F. Party, because the C.C.F. Party was not even thought of then, but by the Conservative Party.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Did this Party of yours ever get any women into this House?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Just a minute. No, but I do think the women put us here; that is why we are on this side of the House.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: And they are going to put us here afterwards, too.

HON. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): You lost a few.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my hon. friends on the other side that I need only go down this attractive list: Minimum Wages for Women - who put that in?

AN hon. MEMBER: $12.50 a week.

MR. FROST: The Conservative Party. Yes. Before the C.C.F. Party was thought of. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that this Party will be here giving progressive legislation to Canada and the people of Ontario oong after the C.C.F. Party is completely forgotten.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I say to my hon. friends opposite, who put women on juries?

AN hon. MEMBER: Who put them on relief?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: May I say, Mr. Speaker, in a select committee of this House ten years ago, a Bill was killed by this little tag and group that sits in the centre over there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: The members then sat all around this House. (Gesture) Who was it brought in the great

principle and passed it, over the facetious and grudging approval of the other side, the great Bill we brought in yesterday of equal pay for women, equal pay for equal work?

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): No, it was not.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I want to go a little further than this and I will give you some history. You know, my hon. friends on the opposite side have very short memories - they do not want to remember. May I say to my friend, the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), the first phase of anti-discriminatory legislation that was ever passed in the province was passed 19 years ago by a Conservative administration, when was introduced The Insurance Act, which contained the following provision:

> "Any licensed issuer which discriminates unfairly between risks within Ontario because of the race or religion of the insured shall be guilty of an offence."

Introduced by a Conservative government, Mr. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and I will say this to you: there was not one line of such legislation introduced in Ontario and passed in Ontario by anything other than a Conservative government.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Now, I did not intend to say these things. I think the address I made on the opening and introducing this Bill was on a different plane altogether because I thought that my hon. friends were going to accept this Bill and approve of it and pass it

without any carping criticism, that they would do so on the broad basis of the good of our people. But they have brought up all of these things and now I would say to my hon. friends something that goes back to 1932; - 1944, the same party and this government here, discriminatory advertising banned. And my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), will try to throw cold water on that and say there were some influences that asked for that Bill to be withdrawn. I say to my colleagues who are sitting here with me and who remember that Bill being discussed, there was never any question about withdrawing all of that Bill, our intention was to proceed with that Bill even though we even had 38 members in a House of 90.

The collective bargaining provision that I referred to yesterday, introduced last year; the discriminatory covenant provision last year; the Fair Employment Practices Bill of today which has won such grudging approval, indeed if it has approval from the Opposition. The Opposition is so doubtful about it that we call on them to vote for this Bill, to stand and be counted, to show whether they are for this Bill or against it.

Nowm Mr. Speaker, may I refer again to another matter of history. Some of us remember sitting in this House when it was a little different than it is now. It was a circular House and the Conservative Opposition, that was to grow into the ruling party of this province, sat where the Opposition sits today; and sitting over just about where the hon. member for Kitchener (Mr. Brown) sits was a gentlemen by the name of Glass - John Glass. John Glass introduced in this House a Bill in

connection with fair employment practices and anti-discrimination and, Mr. Speaker, so help me, he could not get a member of the Liberal Party to second the Bill. That happened in this very Bill, here.

MR. G.E. PARK (Dovercourt): Did a Conservative second it?

MR. FROST: And these "four musketeers" who sit in the front of the Liberal benches were in the House at that time and not one of them would second the Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PARK: Did a Conservative second it?

MR. FROST: We said, "We will second the Bill for you", but Mr. Glass was so ashamed of the attitude of his party that he withdrew the Bill and that is the last we ever heard of it. Now, I ask you this, Mr. Speaker: when I give you this impressive list of things that have been done by the Conservative Party, and I show you the record of the other parties sitting in the House at that time, you can see why it is I am forced to draw these matters to the attention of the House so that the people will really know what the true record is.

MISS MacPHAIL: I knew you had to do it.

MR. FROST: I come now to my good old friend, the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail). You know, my opinion of her went up very considerably - that is, from the standpoint of her political sagacity - this afternoon because the hon. member (Miss MacPhail) says that she took no responsibility for things that were advanced on that side. And I do not blame her a bit - I would be thoroughly ashamed of some of the things

that are advanced from that side of the House and I do not blame her for very adroitly showing her years of experience in parliament by side-stepping that one.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Certainly she was not going to allow herself to be caught in that manner of taking responsibility for some of the things that are advanced from that side.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That was a very adroit dissertation.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I am going to deal with what my hon. friend, the member for York East (Miss MacPhail), has said. First of all, I would get down to that old quotation, I do not know whether I quote it exactly or not: "I would that my enemy would write a book". Well, our enemy - now, until today I never looked upon our Opposition as our enemy; I always thought they were people who had gone astray a little and I always had the light in the window over here for them --

AN hon. MEMBER: We are your advisors.

MR. FROST: But now I have doubts as to being able to win them away from the error of their ways. In any event, the Opposition did not write three books but they wrote three Bills. Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), has gone back many hundreds of years and has told about the progress and the change in the thinking of manking in connection with this problem and after all of those years there is not one person in those Opposition groups that thought of inserting sex in the Bills they introduced. All the Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, in the last week, when

they read it in the papers, thought that sex should be introduced, but none of them in these Bills this year, or other years, ever thought of introducing the word "sex" into these Bills.

MISS MacPHAIL: Oh, yes, I thought of it all the time.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Miss MacPhail) may have thought of it but she did not put it in her Bill.

MISS MacPHAIL: It wasn't my Bill.

MR. FROST: And I have too much confidence in her sagacity, too much respect for her sagacity --

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York West): It didn't get through when she did put it in.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that sex has absolutely no part in this Bill at all and it is silly to argue it. It is only people like my hon. friend, the member for London (Mr. Calder) and some of the hon. members opposite who would argue that sex should be in this Bill at all.

MR. PARK: The editors of the Globe & Mail argued it.

MR. FROST: I am ashamed of the Opposition that they would make a suggestion that such a thing should be introduced in the manner in which they suggest into a Bill --

MR. MILLARD: Are you ashamed if we quote "George McCullagh"?

MR. FROST: Let me point this out: what is this Bill for? Let us get down to basic points in this Bill. This Bill is for minorities, to protect minorities. This Bill, the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail),

is not protect the majority in this province --

MISS MacPHAIL: Well, I am a minority in this House.

MR. FROST: Can you imagine the women if this province asking to be put into a minority Bill? Did you ever hear anything so silly or ridiculous as that? The fact is, looking back into our history, that this Bill was introduced here to protect the stranger within our gates. That is what the Bill is for, that is what it has always been argued that this Bill was for. When you look back in the history of this province, it had its commencement 150-odd years ago when people came here from the States because they wanted to live under the British flag. And we had the United Empire Loyalists who came into this province and they were joined by that great French race from Lower Canada, and between the two of them they founded this country, and they gave a great example of toleration, a great example as to how two races could work together without discrimination.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

Now, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill, as I say, is to bring these minorities, it is to bring these strangers within our gates and that is the purpose of the legislation. Sex has no place in this Bill and we never considered that sex had any place in this Bill.

MR. MILLARD: Some of the strangers may be of that sex.

MR. FROST: Not in all the years, the oppsotion never thought sex had any part in the Bill, and they only ask that today, with their tongues in their cheeks, because it has no place in this legislation at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) never heard of our Equal Pay for Equal Work Bill which you did not have the courage to accept?

MR. FROST: I have read the Bill the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) introduced, I have read the Bill the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) introduced on the first or second day of the session.

MR. WISMER: On a point of order.

MR. FROST: I mean my race horse friend in the back seat.

MR. WISMER: I have never introduced a Bill.

MR. FROST: We think you have too much sense to introduce a Bill and put sex in it.

MR. WALTERS: Thank you very much.

MR. FROST: I would say the same about the Bill introduced by the hon. member for St.Andrew (Mr. Salsberg). They rush them in on the first or second day of the session and leave out 50% of the population of Ontario. It is a ridiculous argument to advance in a House such

as this. I say to the hon. members they should be ashamed to do that. What have we done?

AN hon. MEMBER: Nothing.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: I would point these things out to them, what we have done is this; we have introduced in this Legislature yesterday and passed it over their capricious and frivolous opposition, legislation which the women of this province say constitutes a Bill of Rights for them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Who said that?

MR. FROST: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to you, what would our wives think of us --?

MISS MA CPHAIL: I often wonder.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I might say this to the hon. members opposite, that to introduce sex into a Bill of this sort which is designed to protect minorities is simply unbelievable. Our record for the women of this province is so much higher, we take our women and dignify them with legislation which is separate and which is designed to protect women, 51% of the population of this province that have such a profound effect on the history and upon the course of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in passing I should just like to mention something. You know, it is too, Mr. Speaker, those of the opposite side, there are so many of these things they never think of, they never think of them

until afterwards, and they try to push them in the back door, like putting sex in this Bill. I was much impressed by a statement made to me by the hon. member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Johnston) the other day. He came to me and said, calling me by my first name, he said, "the class that is most discriminated against in this province, and nobody ever mentions them, is the Indians". That is a fact. We have listened to arguments in this House, we have heard all manner of arguments in this House, and we have talked about people who have come in this province suffered discrimination on the grounds of race and creed, but I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no class in this province more discriminated against than the Indians themselves.

MR. PARK; What are you going to do about it?

MR. FROST: I might say, we are examining into this. I can point out to you that the British North America Act provides that the Indians are the wards and under the Act passed by the Federal government; we really have no jurisdiction whatever. However, in the light of the present legislation introduced in the parliament of Canada I hope the Federal government will approach the provinces on some fair, decent basis that will enable us to act as partners in that matter and give these very fine people a break in this country.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: There are about 30,000 or 40,000 Indians in this province and I would like to see them with civil rights; I would like to see them with equality in the matter of health. The other day I

was discussing some matters with some people from Sudbury and the fact came out of the lower Indian state of health as compared with others which is something we should deal with. In the province of Ontario I would like to see our Indians have opportunities of education, I would like to see them on an equal footing with others in the province, with more equality with our people in this province. That is a problem that we are prepared to give our whole cooperation to the federal government. After all, there are many of these things in which we cannot re-write the constitution but we can offer to this problem our help to provide justice for these great people.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Speaker, how many Indians does the Department of Lands and Forests employ?

MR. FROST: I do not know, I will have the hon. Minister (Mr. Scott) count them.

Hon. H.R.SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): I do not know, but our most efficient fire crew are Indians at Red Lake.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, with all the doubts that there are in the minds of hon. members opposite, philosophic doubts and other doubts about this Bill, and the lack of decision as to what is to be done, and after all these years of ---

MR. MILLARD: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) permit a question?

MR. FROST: Sure.

MR. MILLARD: Would you be prepared to support a resolution of this Legislature, a resolution to the Federal Government asking that the Indians be given full citizenship?

MR. FROST: I told you that was an afterthought, I knew they would pick that one.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I might say, Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly frank with you, I am very much opposed to this Legislature addressing a resolution to the Federal Government.

MR. WALTERS: Why?

MR. FROST: I have sat in this House for many years and I think that nothing good can come from that sort of thing. At the present time there are two Notices of Motion on the Order Paper addressed to the Federal Government. Well, I agree with one of these resolutions. I might discuss that later, but I think it is bad business for this Legislature to address a resolution to the Federal Government, We have enough trouble minding our own business.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: You live and learn. I well remember a very hectic time in this Chamber many years ago when a resolution condemning the Federal Government was passed, and I remember the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) voted for it, voted for the resolution, and I think he reneged afterwards.

MR. MacLEOD: Did you vote for it?

MR. FROST: I did, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, it was a profound mistake. It was in 1940, eleven years ago somewhat earlier in the year than this. It was a profound mistake. I believe myself that we should not address resolutions to the Federal Government, it is bad business. I will say to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) that I am goir to see the Prime Minister of Canada and offer him our cooperation in the matter of the protection of the Indians in this province, but I am not going to address any resolutions to him.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is it the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) position that this Legislature has no right to express opinions on matters of that sort?

MR. FROST: I say again, I think we have enough trouble minding our own business without telling the elected representatives at Ottawa what to do.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I think that is good common sense.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The position of the Indians in this province is not our business?

MR. FROST: Do not split hairs, you see we would get along faster if you do not split hairs.

MR. MILLARD: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr.Frost) introduced the question of the Indians, not me.

MR. FROST: I introduced it because, with all the talk the opposition has indulged in, there is not one of them that thought of the 40,000 Indians in this Province.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I say, Mr. Speaker --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Let us hear the question.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): In 1946, I raised the question of the plight of the Indians in my riding and I referred to the situation in Saskatchewan, what they are doing for the Indians and I suggested that this government might do something towards improving the education of the Indians and I suggested also that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) at this time might be made a Chief of Many Promises.

MR. FROST: The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) made a speech over on the other side, he made no impression on his colleagues because we have heard nothing about it from that day to this.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: After all of this facetious opposition that we have had, you can see the temperament, the mentality of the opposition when they start squirming, and twisting, and hair-splitting, no matter what is suggested. However, I think they have difficulty in making up their minds, which no doubt comes from political immaturity and lack of experience but we are going to give them--

MR. WALTERS: No experience.

MR. FROST: We are going to give them the opportunity of climbing on the bandwagon. I would make this observation, that when the chips are down, there will not be one of them that will oppose this Bill, they will go in favor of this Bill, Mr. Speaker,

which is a good Bill.

MISS MACPHAIL: We said so.

MR. FROST: A good Bill, and it is supported by the people of the whole province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Amendment negatived on division:

YEAS: 34

NAYS: 45

Motion agreed to unanimously on division.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I always like to keep the Order Paper cleared up, may I get some agreement from the opposition to move the discharge of Bills 56, 57 and 59 and perhaps the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) may agree to the discharge of Bill No.68.

MR. PARK: Mr. Speaker, with respect to my Bill, more in sorrow than in anger, I am prepared to agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), though the principles of Bill No. 68 are so much better than the Bill that has passed second reading that really it is not the same subject at all, but in order to accommodate the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in his desire to clear up the Order Paper I will move the discharge of Bill No.68.

Motion agreed to: Bill No. 68 discharged.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I am being entirely too technical, but it is awkward to know whether second reading was actually given to Bill No. 121. I do not want any miscarriage at this stage. The rather sloppy language of the Bill should not be duplicated at this time by the

procedure.

Second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 35.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT, 1951

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 35th Order, second reading Bill No. 57, "The Fair Employment Practices Act, 1951", Mr. Walters.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 57, "The Fair Employment Practices Act, 1951," be discharged. I do this with tears in my eyes.

Motion agreed to; Bill No. 57 discharged.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 34.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 34th Order, second reading Bill No. 56, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices", Mr. Calder.

MR. C. C. CALDER (London): Mr. Speaker, with a heavy heart I move the discharge of Bill No. 56, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices."

MOtion agreed to: Bill No. 56 discharged.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 36.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 36th Order, second reading Bill No. 59, "An Act respecting Fair Employment Practices," be discharged at this time.

Motion agreed to: Bill No. 59 discharged.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I think this is an historic occasion, I think this is probably the first time or at least very close to it in the history of this Legislature when it has taken the discharge of four different Bills in order to get one.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Perhaps the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) who has a very good Bill, Bill No. 94, "An Act to amend the Municipal Act," but I understand that is included in a prior form in the Municipal Amendment Act and if he is satisfied perhaps he would move for the discharge of Order No. 42.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste.Marie): Mr.Speaker, I will so do when I feel satisfied that their Bill covers it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. C. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs); Yours says, "All Cities," mine says "All Cities and Towns of 5000."

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): We have some second readings. I think perhaps the hon. member for Waterloo, North (Mr. Brown) would prefer at this late hour to not proceed. If he would prefer it I am quite satisfied.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Thank you.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 24.

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fourth Order; second reading, Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 122, "An Act to amend The Public Utilities Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST:(Prime Minister): Order No. 25.

THE LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-fifth Order; second reading, Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 123, "An Act to amend The Local Improvements Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 26 .

THE DEPARTMENT OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-sixth Order; second reading, Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend The Department of

Municipal Affairs Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 124, "An Act to amend The Department of Municipal Affairs Act".

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I am interested to find out if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is leaving this Department now or is giving up the Department now that he is bringing in a Bill that the Department shall have an Annual Report. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) up to now in some respects has been criticized ---

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, might I revert to the Orders of the Day and call upon the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards), who has some school children in the gallery.

MR. J.F. EDWARDS (Perth): Mr. Speaker, it is not very often we have a group with us as late as this in the afternoon. They are a group of 40 students of Mitchell Night School who are taking a machine and equipment repair course. They are down here under the guidance of Mr. Hillmer, the assistant agricultural representative of Perth County. We are very happy they could find time to spend in a visit here this afternoon.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the reason involved in this matter is in order to have the reports coming in at the same time to the Provincial Secretary. My only idea is to make it stronger and better all the time, instead of, as you say, quitting the Department.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I take it from the remark the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has just made, the inference is that the government is struggling manfully to see to it that all reports are rendered at the same time of the year.

MR. DUNBAR: Annual reports.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is a difference in having reports rendered and in having reports rendered at the same time of the year. Now they come in in the most haphazard and most unchronological order. What does the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) mean by that statement?

MR. DUNBAR: All at the same time. We are trying to co-operate. Do not blame me; I am trying to co-operate.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 27.

THE VITAL STATISTICS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-seventy Order; second reading, Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 125, "An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 28.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-eighth Order; second reading, Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Assessment

Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 126, "An Act to amend The Assessment Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

MR. DUNBAR: Mr. Speaker, this is with the understanding that this goes to the Committee on Municipal Law.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), before it goes there, this will just apply to five acres or more used for farm purposes. I know what the Department has in mind. They want to avoid around the larger cities, and small cities, too, forcing farmers off their farms by reason of high taxation. This will result in what might be called a green belt remaining around the city and under care and in operation until it is needed for sub-division. That is a very good purpose.

I think, however, in addition to farms we should exempt other green belts. We should exempt those forest reserves we were talking about yesterday. They might fall in that category. We might also exempt, in certain cases, golf clubs or recreational clubs which are privately owned and yet serve a public purpose. I pass that on to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) before we get to a discussion in Committee, in case he wishes to enlarge upon it.

MR. GRUMMETT: I wonder if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) would tell us how many of

the previous Bills standing in his name will go to the Committee on Municipal Law.

MR. DUNBAR: There were some very short Bills. But, if you wish them all to go I would be very glad to send them all to the Committee.

MR. GRUMMETT: I presume that is why you were not giving any explanation, or even mentioning them on second reading.

MR. DUNBAR: I would be very glad to send each one of these Bills to the Committee.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 29.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twenty-ninth Order; second reading, Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move second reading of Bill No. 127, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act".

Motion agreed to; second reading of the Bill.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Is the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) satisfied now?

MR. G.I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): It has not gone through the Committee on Municipal Law.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Perhaps the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) has in mind the fate of a previous Bill which went to that Committee and was jettisoned.

MR. DUNBAR: A Private Bill.

MR. DENNISON: The Chain Stores Bill last year.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole.

Motion agreed to.

The House in Committee. (Mr. Stewart in the Chair).

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 11.

THE CHILDREN's PROTECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eleventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Children's Protection Act", Mr. Goodfellow .

Sections one to three inclusive, agreed to.

Bill No. 111 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister (Prime Minister): Order No. 12.

THE MOTHERS' ALLOWANCES ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Twelfth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend The Mothers' Allowances Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Section one agreed to.

On Section two.

MR. W. DENNISON: (St. David): Mr. Speaker, on section two, I wonder if we should use the words in subsection two of section two, on page 2 of the Bill: "... in respect of the husband in the same amount and manner as though the husband were a dependent child..." and if there should not be a different wording. I think that rather degrades the position of a husband

who, through no fault of his own, because of accident or injury, or sickness, or so on, is forced to accept help under this Act. I do not think we should refer to him as though he were a dependent child. I would just suggest we say "as another dependant".

Hon. W.A. GOODFELLOW: (Minister of Public Welfare): I think, Mr. Chairman, it is just a technical point. It is in the Statutes. That is the way we are dealing with the subject. That is, we deal with the husband the same as we deal with a dependant. I really do not see that it is necessary to amend the section. I appreciate the attitude the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) is taking in respect to it. I do not think many of these husbands are going to see the section of the Act and how they are described.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew): Do you not think the wording of this section of the Bill is deliberate, in order to establish the amount he is to receive; in other words, that he is to receive only the amount allowed to an extra child rather than the amount allowed an adult. I think the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) should see it that way. If that is the case, and I believe that is the case, that is why it is worded in that way, it would be all the more reason why it should be amended so that the allowance for an incapacitated husband should be greater than that which we now allow for a child. His requirements may be greater.

Sections two and three agreed to.

Bill No. 112 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 13.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Thirteenth Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend The Unemployment Relief Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Section one agreed to.

On Section two.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, on Section two, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) has thought of applying our legislation to employable people. Let us not put this burden on the municipalities in case they have an employment situation develop. Why not recognize our responsibilities in the province, as we did prior to 1942, when we paid on all people who were not working or who were unemployed, whether they were capable of working or not? I think surely there are regulations which we could invoke to prevent malingerers from taking advantage of the Act. Why not make the Act broad enough to apply to anyone who is unemployed?

Hon. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Chairman, I think this discussion should have taken place on second reading of the Bill, because there is a principle involved in this.

MR. DENNISON: It did.

MR. GOODFELLOW: We are only dealing with the unemployables. Actually, I do not like the wording of the title of the Act, "The Unemployment Relief Act," because it is misleading.

(TAKE "K" FOLLOWS)

Actually what it is is just public assistance to those people who cannot qualify for it under the other existing forms of public assistance. And of course it would be a matter of government policy in respect to unemployable people who find themselves out of work.

Section 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 113 reported.

MR. FROST: Order No. 9.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 9th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 49, An Act to amend the Municipal Act. Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, I move that clause B set out in section 1 of the Bill be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

B. Where land has been acquired under the Industrial Sites Act, being Chapter 246 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1937, or acquired under a by-law passed under this paragraph, and any debt is outstanding in respect of the acquisition of the land or in respect of any services supplied to the land other than services supplied under The Local Improvements Act, all moneys received from the sale or lease of such land shall be used to retire the debt or shall be set aside as a fund to provide for the retirement of the debt, unless the Department upon the request of the council approves the use of any such moneys for another purpose, and when the debt is retired or the amount in the fund is sufficient to provide for the complete retirement

of the debt, the balance of such moneys on hand and any such mon eys received thereafter shall be credited to the general fund of the municipality.

That gives you a windfall. You can have the whole thing after you pay the debt.

SOME hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Well, Mr. Chairman, this has been amended twice now, I think, and I am happy to inform the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that I cannot think of any further objections.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Someone else may do that.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney-General): No, I would not expect so.

MR. DUNBAR: No, if we are past you, we are all right.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Section 1 as amended agreed to.

Sections 2 and 3 agreed to.

Bill No. 49 as amended eported.

MR. HILLARD: I think you will agree it was only "half baked"when it came in the first time.

MR. PORTER: Half a loaf is better than no bread.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Oh, this is a great step forward.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Is it whole wheat bread?

MR. FROST: Order No. 10.

THE LIQUOR LICENCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 10th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 99, An Act to amend the Liquor Licence Act. Mr. Welsh.

Hon. G. A. WELCH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the amendments that are set out in the reprinted copy of the Bill which was discussed the other day, that is, the amendments affecting 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): What is this Bill---69?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: 99.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I would ask if we could revert to Government Notices of Motion and clear up this motion on the Order Paper which permits us to go ahead with one of the other Bills, and then we can come back to Bill No. 99 in a moment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call Order No. 6, and I beg to advise the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor has been advised of the contents of this Resolution and has expressed his approval and has recommended the adoption of the same to the House.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Resolution in connection with Bill No. 117, An Act to amend the Power Commission Act.

Resolved,

That, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may raise by way of loan in the manner provided by The Provincial Loans Act such sums as the Lieutenant-Governor-in Council may deem requisite for the purposes of The Power Commission Act and of The Niagara Development Act, 1951, and the sums so raised may either be advanced to The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario or may be applied by the Treasurer of Ontario in

the purchase of notes, bonds, debentures, or other securities of the Commission issued by the Commission under the authority of The Power Commission Act

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this motion, and it is important I think that we hear from the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) as to the overnment policy--the policy the government intends to pursue in regards to Hydro financing.

MR. FROST: Well, that can come up on the Bill itself.

MR. DENNISON: We can discuss it under the Bill itself?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. DENNISON: I would be quite willing to wait until that time, if it is agreed.

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. DENNISON: It is just a little outside of the Bill.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): As acting Minister of Highways, if there is anything about which you are not quite clear I will be glad to explain it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): You will get those streets paved in Ottawa yet.

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Order No. 10, returning to Bill No. 99.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Just before that is called, I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to reconsider that. Order No. 10 is Bill No. 99, and the reason I am suggesting he should

reconsider it is that I do not think it is necessary to get it into committee to get the further amendment the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) has in mind printed. This is a Bill which has been priu ed and reprinted with certain amendments, and the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) has now sent me a further amendment which has not yet been printed but which he was good enough to let us have in advance. The Bill is an important Bill, there are two different sets of amendments to the amendment--if you know what I mean.

MR. FROST: Would you like the whole Bill held over?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes.

MR. FROST: All right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Besides, I was also going to suggest--

MR. FROST: Then let us have the amendment and get it to the printer.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Exactly what I was going to suggest, get it reprinted first.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, I move that this Bill be amended thereto the following section, section 6--

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Subsection 2.

MR. WELSH: Subsection 2 of section 44 of the Liquor Licence Act is amended by striking out the word "vendor" in the first line and inserting in lieu thereof the word "purchaser"; and by striking out all the words after the word "regulations" in the fourth and fifth line, so that the subsection shall read as follows:

> "Upon any transfer of a license, the purchaser shall pay to the Treasurer of Ontario the monopoly value of the license at the time of the sale, to be issued by a fee, schedule or other method of valuatio as may be prescribed by the regulations;

"And that sections 6 to 12 of the Bill be renumbered as sections 7 to 13."

Motion agreed to.

MR. FROST: Now we will hold over this Bill.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Wait a second. So that we may not be in any doubt or confusion about the matter, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) has just moved a new section, section 6; is that orrect?

MR. WELSH: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To take the place of section 6 which appeared in the original draft of the Bill, is that correct?

MR. WELSH: To take the place of the section 6 in the original Bill. And then the numbers are all moved up one, that is all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, if it takes the place of section 6 in the original draft Bill, why would there be any change in the numbering?

(Page K-7 follows)

MR. WELSH: No, it is a new section.

MR. FROST: It is a new section, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, if it is a new section it cannot be Section 6 in Bill 99.

MR. WELSH: No, I am speaking of the original Bill. I am sorry. The original Bill No. 99, as it was originally printed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I beg your pardon?

MR. WELSH: I was speaking of the Bill as it was originally printed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, Bill 99.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The old 6 is still in there.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then, if the old Section 6 is still in there, how can the amendment just moved become new section 6 without deleting old section 6?

MR. WELSH: The old Section 6 of the Liquor Licence Act as amended, becomes Section 7, of the new Bill, and new Section 6 is inserted before it. It is to keep the continuity of thought in the Bill in proper order.

MR. JOLLIFFE: O.K.

MR. MILLARD: It is just another amendment added.

MR. FROST: Order No. 14. That is non-contentious.

THE JURORS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 14th Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 119, An Act to amend the Juros Act. Mr. Porter.

Sections 1 to 4 inclusive agreed to.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, just so that no one will get

the wrong idea: I am afraid the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) was not right in suggesting yesterday that school teachers are exempt.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): I did not hear that. What was that?

Sections 5 to 12 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 119 reported.

MR. FROST: Do you want 15 held over?

MR. JOLLIFFE: What is 15?

MR. FROST: "Fair Remunerations for Female Employees."

AN hon. MEMBER: Oh, yes, hold off that.

MR. FROST: If you are satisfied, we will let it go. If you have amendments, we will hold it.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Hold it.

MR. FROST: Don't tell me you are going to amend it? With respect to school teachers; we have felt they were exempt under the Jurors Act. Perhaps we should revert to that section and insert them there, although--after all, they can exempt themselves.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, I do not know that anything turns on it, Mr. Chairman, I am not even prepared to guarantee they are not exempted under the present Act, but I looked at the Act and could not find they were exempted as the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) told us yesterday.

I never liketo dispute the advice given by another member of the legal profession, even if I know it is all wrong, but I do feel since it came up yesterday and since no doubt the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) is relying on the hon. Attorney-General's (Mr. Porter) advice in this connection, perhaps it should be clarified.

MR. PORTER: Well, the escape clauses are so broad it does not make any difference anyway.

(Take L follows)

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, I am always the first to admit that I am wrong, just as the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) admits he is wrong, except he so seldom admits it, even though he is always wrong.

I was under the impression that school teachers were covered by the Act, but I find now they are not, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) is quite right.

MR. MILLARD: As usual.

MR. PORTER: We need not get into personal discussions at this time, B ut inasmuch as all women under the Act may be exempt, if they wish, I do not know that the matter is of any vital importance, although it is quite right that the statement I originally made was incorrect.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) recognized that school teachers are not covered, the argument I advanced yesterday for the element of property qualifications, in sub-section of Section (1) of the Act, should really be amended, and these qualifications be removed, so that public school teachers, if they desire to serve on juries when summoned to do so, should have the opportunity regardless of property qualifications.

Would the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) admit he was right also in arguing against that, and has now changed his mind?

Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) care to answer?

MR. PORTER: If the hon. member (Mr.Salsberg) will sit down. We cannot both stand at once.

MR. SALSBERG: I will be glad to sit down, if I can obtain an answer to my question.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member's (Mr. Salsberg) point has

really nothing to do with the error in which I became involved yesterday.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Attorney-General (Mr.Porter) please reply to my question.

MR. PORTER: My error was not an error of judgment or a matter of opinion; it is simply an error of memory which really does not go to the root of the question the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) is now asking. I do not think my memory is wrong on that.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) still insist on property qualifications?

MR.PORTER: I stand by what I said yesterday.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Private Bills. Order No. 46.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-sixth Order, the House in Committee on Bill No.19, "An Act respecting the City of Hamilton", Mr. Easton.

Sections 1 to 8 inclusive agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. 19 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister); Order No. 47.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-seventh Order; House in Committee on Bill No. 24, "And Act Respecting The City of Ottawa", Mr. Morrow.

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive agreed to.

Schedules a, b, c, d agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

B ill No. 24 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 48.

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forth-eighth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting Victoria University", Mr. Allen.

Sections 1 to 11 agreed to.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo North): From where are you dealing those cards?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sections 12 to 21 inclusive agreed to.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, this is a very important Bill regarding one of the great institutions in Canada, and I think these should be passed with great solemnity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would presume that any hon. members who had an objection to make would have a note of it, that is why I carried them through in this manner. However, if you wish me to go through them section by section, I will do so.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think you are doing very well.

Bill No. 31 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 49.

THE TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Forty-ninth Order, House in Committee on Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting The Township of East York", Miss MacPhail.

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to.

Bill No. 23 reported.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report certain Bills with amendment, and certain Bills without amendment.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes (Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair).

MR. H.A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House begs to report certain Bills with amendment and certain Bills without amendment, and moves the adoption of the Report.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Deputy Speaker, tomorrow afternoon it is desirable to adjourn at 5 o'clock. The Opposition have had their day today, and the press will have their day tomorrow, and their field day tomorrow evening, and it is desirable that the House not sit beyond 5 o'clock, because they are really going to "go to town".

It occurs to me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that tomorrow the House might consider it advisable instead of meeting at 2 o'clock to meet at 1:30, and adjourn at 5 o'clock. That is perhaps somewhat unusual, but I have enquired from the hon. members of this side, and apparently it would be satisfactory to them, and would give us 3½ hours for business.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What about the Fish and Game Committee?

MR. FROST: If the hon. members think it is undesirable, I will leave it at 2 o'clock. It was only a question of getting in the extra half-hour.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Personally I do not care. I am just anticipating some protest that might arise.

MR. FROST: Mr. Deputy Speaker, has any other hon. members any objection to voice.

(No response).

MR. FROST: In that case, I will move the motion with which everybody is familiar now, only putting in "1:30" instead of "2 o'clock".

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is Private Members Day, but I think we have reached the stage where it is pretty difficult to keep a Private Members Day each week.

On the Order Paper there is Bill 97, Order 43, respecting The Consumers Gas Company, and then there is Resolution No. 4 in connection with the same subject matter. If we meet at 1:30, I would like to deal with those two Orders, and then, Mr. Speaker, I think we will go to government Orders. I will do the best I can with the balance of these Private Members Bills, and call them as soon as possible. There are several Bills relating to highways, which I would not like to call unless the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is here, which I thihk will be in the course of a day or two. I think we might arrange to call private Bills at odd times, and clear as many of them off the Order Paper as we can. In the meantime, if we can follow along having a Private Members Day on Wednesdays, all right.

Mr. Speaker, I can see difficulties next week. It is our hope that the House may adjourn for the Easter recess on Wednesday night. I think we might meet at 2 o'clock, and have a night sitting on Wednesday night, and then have no sitting of the House on Thursday, nor on the following Monday. That would enable us to

clear up a lot of business on Wednesday of next week. If we can fit in a Private Members Bill or two in the odd hour, we will do that, but tomorrow we will take these two items, and then give government business precedence over private bills.

I think this year, by our method, we have covered a great many Private Bills, and I hope we will be able, even if we cannot cover them in an hour, to at least call them, even if we adopt the method used last year and adjourn them, but at least it provides an opportunity for the Sponsor to speak to the Bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr.Porter, that when the House adjourns the present sitting thereof, it stands adjourned until 1:30 of the clock tomorrow afternoon, and that the provisions of Rule 2 of the Assembly be suspended insofar as they apply to this motion.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is carried, may I say I realize there is much government business which should be advanced, although most of it is not of a controversial nature, as I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows. Most of it is similar to a number of Bills which received second reading and went through Committee late this afternoon. They were not contentious, and took very little time.

Now, with regard to the Order Paper and the Private Bills and Resolutions; I believe I am in the position in this House where no Bill nor Resolution of mine has ever been called. I suppose government had its own good reasons for that. I prefer to believe the reason was that the government did not want to face up to them.

I have an item on the Order Paper which, to a very considerable degree, was discussed in the Speech from the Throne. The government, through the mouth of His Honor undertood to give certain advice to the government of Canada. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) told us that no good could come from the Legislature expressing itself on matters of this kind. I take a little different view of the place and status of this House. I appreciate the point that no good purpose would be served by the firing of cannon balls from Toronto to Ottawa, and vice versa. With that I agree. But I think also there are occasions in which the province finds itself in a position where to do justice in the discharge of its own responsibilities, it must express an opinion in the direction of Ottawa. And in this particular case -- in connection with this particular Resolution -- which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) knows is one of the most important questions before the Nation and the province -- I am not going to acquiesce in his proposal that this Legislature should remain silent, and that this particular Order should never be called. I do not follow the reasoning which holds that everybody but the Legislature can express its view on matters of this sort, that the government can express its view; every other Tom. Dick and Harry can express their views, but not the Legislature; that the Legislature should be inhibited and circumscribed within very narrow limits in expressing its view on a matter of great national and provincial importance.

That is my view, and I hope it will be taken into consideration.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, this is important. If the

Resolution by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), numbered 2 -- which is under "Notices of Motion" -- personally I said practically all of those things myself. I have expressed opinionx,so I have no hesitation about that. But I must say that I not only have grave doubts, but I have great opposition, in my own mind, to officially passing Resolutions directed to the Government at Ottawa. I think it is quite in order for us to express our own individual views, but, on the other hand, on some things perhaps we go far astray. And I think we may perhaps be going very far astray in discussing matters of foreign relations in this House. This is the place where we have freedom of speech, and if an hon. member wants to speak on it, I do not think we would object. But the matter of placing the House, as such, on record by addressing a Resolution upon which the House voted, to the Ottawa Government, I think is bad practice, and it leads to misunderstandings.

May I ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) what he would think if the Parliament at Ottawa passed a Resolution telling the Ontario government to do something. I think he would feel that Ottawa should keep within the limits of its own business, and not tell us what to do. I imagine, if the Parliament at Ottawa passed a resolution telling the Ontario Government what to do, that for once I could count upon a united point of view from this entire House. I think that would apply also to any of the Legislatures of Canada.

I will say, Mr. Speaker, that I find myself in

general agreement with the Resolution by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), but I do not think it is good business for us to pass a resolution here which could be taken by Ottawa as our giving them our views as to how they should run the business for which they are elected. I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will see the point.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will be speaking on the Budget one of these days, and I think he could very properly mention those things at that time. I mentioned in the Budget many things relating to economic conditions here, and they are taken by Ottawa as some of the comments we make here, and they are not taken as a resolution of this House directed to the Ottawa government, telling them what to do. Experience has shown us that we accomplish nothing; it is not good in Federal-Provincial relationships; it is, in many ways, outside the sphere of this House, and the purposes for which the hon. members of this House are elected.

These are our views, and I may say to the hon. members that we have had experience in that sort of things.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I know that.

MR. FROST: Back in 1940, I voted for a Resolution which was critical of Ottawa. My hon. friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) did not. The hon. member sitting as Leader of the Liberal Group (Mr. Oliver) left the Chamber, and I never saw a man get out of this House faster in my life.

MR. OLIVER: And I will do it again.

MR. FROST: I did not leave, but I made up my mind I would not never do it again. I do not think it is good business. I would advise the hon. members of this House, not to do it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and in so doing I point out that my Resol[illegible] does not tell Ottawa what to do; it is more solicitously worded; it is what I would welcome, and I see no harm in it.

Does not the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) recognize a distinction between matters which are exclusively under Federal jurisdiction, such as defence, and matters which are of mixed concern, such as the matters referred to in my Resolution? After [illegible], this is not the field in which the Federal Government has exclusive responsibility and jurisdiction; it is not one where the Federal Government is being called upon to accept added responsibility. It is, therefore, of mixed concern, and we are bound to recognize that both governments have a certain amount of sovereignty and certain responsibilities. What one does, affects the actions of the other.

Is there any distinction between those two?

MR. FROST: There may be, but the distinction may be in the nature of splitting hairs. Here we have something under the "Property and Civil Rights'" section of the British North America Act. Of course, the government of Ontario --this Legislature -- has the right to impose controls. I think that is correct, Mr. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) ? But that is utterly and entirely unworkable.

We have the power, but we cannot do it. It is utterly impossible to have anything such as controls here in the province.

On the other hand, I think the Federal government have over-riding powers, under Orders in Council, under The British North America Act to do things in a state of emergency, so they have the right to do things now, because we are in a state of emergency, and we could successfully argue that we have jurisdiction in the matter of rents. They have already passed an Act giving them very wide powers in regard to controls. It is not a question of divided jurisdiction; we think now they have entire jurisdiction, because of the days in which we live.

I would suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that we think this over. Sometimes snap decisions are not good. Let us think it over.

In the meantime, we have to matters we can discuss tomorrow, and in the meantime we can consider the question. Of course, we want to let the press away at 5 o'clock.

MR. FARQUHAR OLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a word to clarify our position in regard to and our attitude toward this particular Resolution in the name of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe). The House is well aware it would be our political party in the Legislature which would be embarrassed here by this particular Resolution. But I want to say definitely to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and to the House that as a Party we are prepared to take our stand on that Resolution, if it be called. In fact, I think perhaps

it should be called, now that it is there.

But on the broader and more general subject which has been discussed tonight I find myself in agreement with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost).

I have always held the idea that we have in Ottawa 85 or 87 Federal members, and it is their obligation to interpret the desires and wishes of the people of Ontario in regard to Federal enactments.

I am quite sure that the Federal administration is aware of what we enunciate with regard to the matters contained in the Resolution by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), and I sure, as well, they are trying to meet the problems as they arise.

As far as we are concerned, we do not want the Resolution dis-allowed or withdrawn because of any feeling we might have on this particular subject.

MR. FROST: I have not the slightest intention of assisting my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver).

MR. OLIVER: It left that impression, and I wanted to dissipate it.

MR. FROST: I have endeavoured to assist my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) on a number of occasions, but they have always slipped and fallen --

MR. OLIVER: Perhaps it would be better if you did not try to assist us at all.

MR. FROST: However, I will not press the point.

MR. A.A. MACLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to say a word on the subject matter which has been discussed. I will say it on a later occasion, but may I ask a question? Will the hon. Prime Minister, (Mr. Frost) tell us what we may expect in regard to answers to the 250 questions on the Order Paper?

MR. FROST: I will be quite frank about it and say that this year we have really endeavoured to answer questions as quickly as possible. Some of the questions which have been asked would take hundred of employees of the province of Ontario -- all drawing salaries -- days and days, and in some cases, months to answer.

I was going to raise that point in the House and say we will do our best. We have given our intention, and we have given evidence of trying to carry it out. We have hurried along as best we could, but I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we will have to take the attitude, that, while we do the best we can, we are not bound to answer any question. That is a matter of courtesy and assistance to the members.

There is one question about which the Department concerned spoke to me, in regard to advertising. It would take weeks of time of employees who are engaged in the important work of this province, to answer that question. It may be that we will simply have to say we will do the best we can, and if we cannot answer a question, it will have to go by the Board. That is the position I will have to take with the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod). I think we have done a good job so far. There are so many things affecting the life and being of our people, that we cannot take people off of important jobs to answer questions which are really in most cases going beyond the bounds of what we think is reasonable. I know the hon. members are asking these questions in order to get information, but, as I say, many of them go beyond the bounds of reason.

MR. MACLEOD: You asked about the same number of questions when you were in opposition.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I was going to say that, Mr. Speaker. We think when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his colleagues were sitting in opposition, they did a pretty good job of asking questions.

MR. FROST: You did your best to keep it up this year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I think there is more than courtesy involved here. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) put the matter on the wrong level when he said that answers were given as a matter of courtesy.

MR. FROST: I remember back in 1911 or thereabout, Sir James Whitney refused to answer any questions, because he said the questions were useless.

MR. MACLEOD: Any man who does that should be defeated.

MR. FROST: Perhaps I was under the age of 21 then, but I knew enough about public affairs, to have a vote.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If Sir James Whitney did that, I think he departed from a long established parliamentary practice. That is one mark on the Conservative record which I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would be willing to keep silent about.

I appreciate an effort was made to get the answers in good time, and I think the government did very well for about a month -- and not so well recently. I hope they will continue their efforts. If there is a question which involves far more than was anticipated by the hon. member who asks the question, then I would suggest there be some consultation with him to see whether an alternative

form of question would satisfy him, or whether he really needs the information he is seeking.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.23 of the clock p.m.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XXX

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14th, 1951

The House having met.

Prayers.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Committees.

Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the Day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I have answers here to questions 234, 14, 188, 143, 132, 237, 238 and 235, all of which shows how well we try to get along.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): There seems to be quite a number yet, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I beg to present the following:

(1) 19th Annual Report of the Department of Public Welfare for the fiscal year, 1949-1950.

(2) The Annual Report of the Inspector of Legal Offices for the year ended December 31, 1950.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Third readings. Order No. 1.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, third reading of Bill No. 19, "An act respecting The City of Hamilton", Mr. Easton.

MR. J.L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 19.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 2.

THE CITY OF OTTAWA

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Second Order, third reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting The City of Ottawa", Mr. Morrow.

MR. D.H. MORROW (Carleton): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 24, "An Act respecting The City of Ottawa".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 3.

VICTORIA UNIVERSITY

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Third Order, third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting Victoria University", Mr. Allen.

MR. H.M. ALLEN (Middlesex South): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 31, "An Act respecting Victoria University".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 4.

THE TOWNSHIP OF EAST YORK

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fourth Order, third reading of Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting The Township of East York", Miss MacPhail.

MR. C.H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of Miss MacPhail I move third reading of Bill No. 23, "An Act respecting The Township of East York".

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 5.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Fifth Order, third reading of Bill No. 49, "An Act to amend The Municipal Act", Mr. Dunbar.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 49.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 6.

THE CHILDRENS PROTECTION ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Sixth Order, third reading of Bill No. 111, "An Act to amend The Childrens Protection Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I move third reading of Bill No. 111.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 7.

THE MOTHERS ALLOWANCE ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventh Order; third reading of Bill No. 112, "An Act to amend The Mothers Allowance Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I beg to move third reading of Bill No. 112.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 8.

THE UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Eighth Order; third reading of Bill No. 113, "An Act to amend The Unemployment Relief Act", Mr. Goodfellow.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Goodfellow, I move third reading of Bill No. 113.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 9.

THE JURORS ACT

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Ninth Order, third reading of Bill No. 119, "An Act to amend The Jurors Act", Mr. Porter.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 119.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resolved that the Bill do now pass and be intituled as in the motion.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Public Bills, Order No. 17.

THE CONSUMERS GAS COMPANY OF TORONTO

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: Seventeenth Order, second reading of Bill No. 97, " An Act respecting The Consumers Gas Company of Toronto", Mr. Park.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Deputy Speaker, before the hon. member (Mr. Park) speaks to this Bill, I would like to inform the House that following this, I will call No. 4 in the Notices of Motion, standing in the name of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), which deals with this same subject matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the subject matter of these bills is something in which the government has some interest, and for reasons to which I shall refer when I speak on this Bill, I obtained some information concerning a number of points, not only relating to the Consumers Gas Company, but relating to the problem generally in Ontario.

However, in order to secure information for the House, I asked the Consumers Gas Company certain specific questions, to which they gave me answers. I asked them then, to reduce the answers to a form which I could hand to the hon. members of the House, because it will save a considerable amount of time. I have already

given copies to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe), the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), and the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod), and I will send a copy to the mover, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park). These are matters which are relevant to the matter we are going to discuss today. Later on I will give copies to all the hon. members of the House.

MR. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 97, "An Act respecting The Consumers Gas Company of Toronto".

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the purposes of this Bill are set ou t in the explanatory notes. They limit the dividends which may be paid by the Consumers Gas Company of Toronto to a rate of 5% per annum. For the information of hon. members of the House, it should be said that the rate is now limited to 10% per annum, but in recent years the Company has been paying 8% per annum.

The second section of the Bill is aimed at requiring the Company to make available to the City Council of the City of Toronto full information with respect to the affairs of the Company.

The hon. members of the House may know that there was recently announced an increase in the price of gas in the Toronto area. This led to an inquiry, which was set up by His Worship the Mayor of the City, on which was represented a number of diverse groups in the community.

One thing which became clear during the course of that inquiry was that the members of that Committee were not able to obtain all the information it was felt they were entit led to, in order to decide whether or not an

increase in gas rates was justified. If I may deal with that section of the Bill, it provides that the City Council of Toronto may request, and when they do request, the Company must make available to the City Council or any Committee authorized by it, full access to the financial records of the Company.

The Consumers Gas Company has, of course, a monopoly in this field, in the Toronto area. It is operating under a statute which was written originally in 1848, and the figure of "10%" as a matter of fact, appears in the 1848 statute.

During the last number of years, the Company has had reasonably good returns. It seems to me that to any company which is in a completely monopolistic position, a 10% retur n is excessive, and cannot be justified. That there would be a saving to the consumers of gas in the Toronto area, if there was a reduction to 5%, there can be no doubt.

The enquiry made by the Committee of the City Council brought to light certain facts. First of all, the fact that the real estate, plant and equipment value increased by $6,300,000. between 1940 and 1950, and that the Company, in that 10 year period, has paid to its shareholders $13,168,000. The enquiry brought to light other things as well, For instance, the financial structure of the Company under the old Act -- which, as I say, has been on the statute books since 1848, and which was amended by regulations in 1887 -- has been criticised by a number of people who are competent to criticise it.

I have in my hand a memorandum from D. McClelland, of Price Waterhouse Company with respect to provisions in the gas companies' arrangement, in which he says:

> "In my opinion, the method of basing the company's present accounting requirements on an old regulation of 1887, based on cost of physical assets acquired and constructed during the past 63 years, is unsound and does not result in determining accurate figures of net profits."

As the result there has been the payment of large dividends and the building up of large reserves over the years. The Company has built up a reserve, which comprises almost a guaranteed divident to its shareholders.

In the renewal fund in 1950 they set aside a reserve of $9,700 ,000. and in their general reserve, another amount of $3,400,000. Over a period of years, because they were required to do so by the old Act, they built up the renewal funds which the accountants frankly regard, as set up, as being unsound and not resulting in determining the accurate figures of the net profits.

The Company has over the years increased its gas rates to the consumers in the Toronto district, in the following manner.

First, through inaugurating a meter charge of 50 cents in 1922; and then increasing the charge to a minimum of 75 cents in 1941; an increase in the minimum charge in 1947 and a further increase in rates; and a further increase in the minimum charge; and a further

increase of rates in 1948; and of course the increase of rates which was announced just recently, and now in effect, of 7½%.

The purpose of the amendment is very simple, and I do not think it requires a great deal of explanation. With a Company of the character of the Consumers Gas Company, having a monopolistic position, it is ridiculus to permit dividend payments allowed by the 1848 Act. The time has come for us to bring these dividend payments into line with the general position of the Company as a monopolistic concern. In the City of Toronto and its suburbs, which is supplied by the Gas Company, there may be price increases which may be caused from other reasons, such as increasing costs in connection with the manufacture of their gas.

I do not think there can be any objection to the second section. We all acknowledge the fact that it is important that the public representatives elected by the City of Toronto shall have access to The Consumers Gas records, since it does enjoy that monopolistic position.

I do not want to go further into the matter at this time. I think the amendments are self-explanatory. I ask the government to give consideration to it in the interest of the gas consumers in this area. I am sure it is true that if the provision is accepted with respect to the reduction of the dividend limit, the present increase in the cost of gas in Toronto and area could be prevented. That would be one contribution this government could make to meet inflationary problem which is bothering all the citizens of the province of Ontario.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

I would ask that the government give serious consideration to this Bill. I think, as a matter of fact, that the whole Bill of 1848 and the amendments that have been made subsequent thereto could stand review. I think the time has come where some the the things which turned up in the inquiry with respect to reserve funds and trusts which are authorised by the Acts ought all to be examined in line with the recommendations or findings of some of the accountants that examined the books. Perhaps, if the government will accept this Bill we might even go further in committee in making some of the improvements that the accountants and others recommended in the discussions that proceeded before the enquiry established by the Mayor of the city of Toronto.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I believe the Legislature has just a little bit more responsibility in the case of this company than we have in a general company because this is partly owned by the taxpayers of the city of Toronto. There is a certain block of shares owned by the city and have been owned since the company was first established, the Mayor sits on the Board of Directors of the company by virtue of that fact and gets a remuneration of approximately $1,000. a year to represent the city Council in the company. However, the legislation does not give the aldermen the same information about it as they receive, for instance, about their municipally owned Hydro Electric System and I think there is a very good reason for this Bill to be passed, if for no other reason than to provide adequate information to the people's representatives about this

Gas company.

Now, the Legislature also has a responsibility I think in present times to retard any price increases that may be proposed. The company made a case for an increase of 7½% last November, 1950, the city of Toronto appointed nine people to investigae and that report was made back to the Council. The nine people split on the question, six of them thought the company were entitled to an increase of 7½% in their rates but three of them thought the government was not entitled to an increase on their rates. I must say, I agree with the three people who thought the company was not entitled to an increase and I want to tell the Legislature why. This company, last year, to pay their dividends, took $681,000 out of their reserves. Now, you will remember that the same thing happened in connection with the Bell Telephone Company last year to pay their dividends; they depleted their reserves. I do not think a company should do that and then come to the people and say "we have to increase the rates to replenish these reserves". There is such a thing as reducing dividends and, of course, that might have occurred to the company but why should the person who uses gas always be the person who has to pay the bill? The interest in keeping the price of gas at a low cost is not only the interest of the domestic consumer of gas, it is in the interest of the manufacturers of the city of Toronto that the price of gas be kept at the lowest point because gas is used extensively in manufacturing in this city. I would like to remind the Legislature that years ago when the province of Ontario decided to make Hydro

Electric a public utility in this province it was not only the small rural and city consumers who stood to benefit from hydro being made a public utility and the cost kept down. Because of that fact the manufacturers of Ontario have been the greatest people to benefit or have benefitted in the greatest amount because of the provincial policy of making Hydro a public utility.

Now, we will soon be importing gas into Ontario. The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) presented a Bill the other day which was passed to allow a large gas line to be built with the least possible obstruction to the city of Toronto and when this natural gas is sold in Toronto it will be sold by the existing company in the city of Toronto. This natural gas will provide double the heating value per unit of manufactured gas, it will be cheaper than the present gas and this company will be the company that will benefit and will have the contract for the sale of that in this whole area.

Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has handed us a review of their position by the company this afternoon and their argument is this, that the purchasers of their shares have put their shares up from $100. par value to $201. a share because of the fact ---

MR. FROST: I say this to the hon. Member (Mr. Dennison), the money went into the treasury of the company. What you are asking to be done is that no regard should be paid to that, the fact that they paid $201. a share you forget all about that and pay them rates calculated on a par value of $100.

MR. DENNISON: That is right.

MR. FROST: You ought to be ashamed of yourself.

MR. DENNISON: The last sale of stock by this company occurred in 1937 and they sold shares to the value of $500,000. and they got a premium of $505,772.--

MR. FROST: Which went into the treasury, now you are going to write that off.

MR. DENNISON: Which went to the treasury. Now, their argument is, we must consider the buyers of the last half a million dollars worth of shares, we must consider the buyers alone but the very fact that the bonds sold for double their par value is proof that this province back farther than 1937 should have reduced the interest rate, the ten per cent interest rate.

MR. FROST: Could I ask the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) to go to the next paragraph and see what happened in previous years and that will puncture that little argument.

MR. DENNISON: All right, the same thing happened as in the sale of 1937, the surplus went into the hands of the company.

MR. FROST: To give service to the people.

MR. DENNISON: In some instances in previous years I suppose the surplus went into the hands of the people who sold ---

MR. FROST: It went into the company to build gas mains and the like.

MR. DENNISON: Is it a good principle to allow a public utility to be fixed at ten per cent dividends when the market itself will automatically reduce those dividends to the purchasers by 4.9% or 3.98%? Are we

going to be governed by an artificial dividend rate in these companies which costs the consumers money?

MR. FROST: That is what my friend is advocating, he wants a reduced dividend rate but wants it at 3% which would give them 1½% on the money given by them.

MR. DENNISON: Just the group who purchased the last lot of shares, that one small group, the ones who purchased previously would get an adequate return. We have to draw the line somewhere, we have to consider in the public interest, shall we judge here between the shareholders, this small group of shareholders, not all the shareholders, this small group, or shall we allow ourselves to be influenced by the broad interests of the consumers of gas and that includes rich and poor in this city.

Now, I think this is an opportunity to put human welfare and the welfare of this city ahead of an artificially high dividend rate which the market itself has knocked down, knocked down to its proper size and which I say this Legislature should have knocked down to its proper size years ago.

Over the past ten years the company claimed that their capital, their working capital has decreased by $320,000. On the other hand, their assets have increased, their real estate, their plant equipment in the same period by $6,310,000; they have increased their inventories by $1,325,000., an increase of eight million dollars and the minority of the committee says that they find it impossible to justify an increase in the price of gas because of the improved financial position of the

company over the last ten years and they quote that fact.

MR. FROST: Who quoted that?

MR. DENNISON: This is the minority report signed by Controller Allan Lamport, by Ford Brand, representing the Toronto District Labour Council and by Mrs. G. Klink, representing the local Council of Women.

MR. FROST: Would the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) read the majority report?

MR. DENNISON: That is a long document, I would not like to take the time of the House to read that. I think that is all I have to say on the matter. I do think the minority report made a good case for the reduction and the free market has made it better for the reduction of this 10% to 5%.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with this problem, the matter that is advanced by this Bill which in main is also the principle of the resolution which will be called following. It is not my intention to refer to the resolution or to speak on the resolution at any length. Any of the reasons I advance in connection with this Bill would apply to the resolution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill, Bill No. 97, refers not to companies like the Consumers' Gas Company as the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) said, it refers only to the Consumers' Gas Company. The resolution which is also on the Order Paper, and it will be discussed, differs in that it refers to the Consumers' Gas Company and quite obviously refers to gas companies in South-

western Ontario, The Union Gas Company, The Dominion Gas Company and United Gas Company and a number of other samll companies operating down in that locality. Now, Mr. Speaker, myself I have had virtually no dealings with the Consumers' Gas Company other than collecting for the province 7% of their earnings by way of Corporation Tax. With these other companies, however, I have had a very considerable amount of dealing, not only in collecting their 7% which is contributed by the people of this province in the way of taxation, but during the days I was hon. Minister of Mines I had many, many difficulties in that country. I remember the hon. Member for Essex, North (Mr. Ellis), who sits up in the north west corner there and will well recall the great difficulties we had in the Windsor area, and I had many dealings at that time with his Council, with the Mayor of Windsor, with the Mayors and Reeves of many of the Municipalities down there. I can just repeat here to the hon. members of the House the highly hazardous nature of that business in the dealings that we had. Our dealings down there were through the official referee, the Natural Gas Commissioner. The Natural Gas Commisioner during the war is sitting under the gallery at the present time. I know something about the difficulties of thosedays and those times. We met here in this very building, representatives from the various municipalities, the whole question of rate structure was considered, rate hearings were held and as a result, with the acquiescence not only of the people of Windsor but assistance -- I am very glad to acknowledge it -- from the Trade Unions and others down

there we got that business back on the rails, and we were able to prevent, in 1948 and following, some 25,000 people being laid off there because there was a sensible and logical approach to the financial problems of these companies. The books of the companies were gone over, the rates were increased. The hon. member for Essex, North (Mr. Ellis) will well remember this, that the Councils then agreed to the rate increase with the result that the rate was streamlined and made adquate and services were extended, with the result that not only now have the people of southwestern Ontario adequate supplies of gas to a very vast extent, and billions of cubic feet of natural gas being brought into this province and elsewhere, and that is completely changing the position in the province. Only a few days ago the House got around to a Bill consenting to the building of pipe lines across the province. Obviously this is creating a new situation and that is what I meant when I said that this was a problem in which the government was very definitely interested.

The Conservation and Fuel Supply Act gives powers to the official referee to set rates and to investigate the affairs of those dealing with natural gas. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that does not apply to the Consumers' Gas Company, or to other gas companies, which may be in existence in the province of Ontario. Now, why we are interested is this, quite obviously with the extension of the gas business, with the bringing in of billions of cubic feet of gas from Texas and other places and now probably from Canada, the Canadian West, we hope from

the Canadian West, we will be getting supplies from the American Union as alternative supplies to Canadian gas. Obviously, I think the Conservation and Fuel Supply Act will have to be extended and will probably extend to other companies other than the traditional companies which some of us have had dealings with such as The Dominion Gas Company and the Union Gas Company and other companies.

Now, that is a problem to which we are giving study and I might say we have had it intimated to us, by other utility companies, that they are anxious to come into some such form as we have in the present case relating to companies dealing with natural gas. That is a very changing business, any municipality that would want to get into it as a publicly owned utility, I suggest they look at the hazards of this. First of all, in my own experience when I was hon. Minister of Mines back in 1943, the greater portion of our gas came from natural gas which suffered terrific depletion during the war days as a result of our work. About 1946 the emphasis went to a type of manufactured gas which was mixed with natural gas, that gas was in the form of propaine, plants were erected in Brantford, the United Fuel plant in Hamilton, and a plant at Port Stanley. In 1948, the emphasis changed with the result that instead of using largely natural gas in the province we were using largely manufactured gas, and the natural gas was only used to step up the BTU content of the gas.

Now, in discussion this morning -- it shows how quickly things change -- discussing this matter this

morning with Mr. Croucher who had charge of this during the war, and who has been intimately in touch with this problem, Mr. Croucher told me that in all probability manufactured gas in regard to this province of Ontario would completely go out, the emphasis would be on imported gas. Now, what does that mean? Just two years ago about this time I was down in St.Thomas and took part in the opening of the great plant constructed by The Dominion Gas Company at Port Stanley, I think, involving an expenditure of about two million dollars or thereabout. The probability is that in a short time that plant with all the investment there, due to the changes that have tkane place in the gas business, that plant may become merely a standby, a plant which will not be used except for a standby. You can see the hazards of any municipality getting into that type of business. The fact is, it is highly hazardous and difficult. It is only a short time ago since the Dominion Gas Company, or the Union Gas Company constructed a pipe line across the St.Clair River, in anticipation of getting three billion feet of gas per year. Mr. Speaker, for two or three years they did not get a foot of gas across that line, they were affected by political conditions in the States, situations there, shortage of fuel in the States, and for those two years they did not get a foot of gas through those lines. It began to look, and the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) will recollect this, in my dealings with the Council of the city of Windsor, we almost ruled that off in our calculations,the fact that we could get gas through in order to keep men and

women at work and give them services in their home. Then events turned and the employees were put to work on the construction of plants to manufacture artificial gas, which, as I say, today in 1951 perhaps may be outmoded and may be merely standby plants. That is the type of thing that makes it hazardous in this business today. Some of the hon. members here glibly say the municipalities of this province ought to get into it.

MR. PARK; We did not say that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We do not say that.

MR. FROST: All right, you do not say that. We understood you did. However, you did not say it. I often wonder if you know what you do say, I often wonder what you have said.

MR. J. L. DOWLING (Hamilton,East): Manufactured gas.

MR. FROST: There is a lot of manufactured gas on the other side over in that corner.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I would say again, any municipality that wants to get into the gas business as a public utility should carefully weigh all the interests in this case, it is full of difficulties and hazards.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We agree with that.

MR. FROST: We are in agreement with that, perhaps we can proceed. I would now like to turn to the investigation of the Consumers' Gas Company here last fall which the hon. member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) has been very careful to only read part to this House, the minority report, and has pushed over the report to the hon.members of this House in a manner calculated to make the hon.

members believe that the minority report represented what that committee actually thought. Now, Mr. Speaker, what happened is this ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: He said it was a minority report.

MR. FROST: All right, he said it was a minority report. Now, Mr. Speaker, first let me say this in connection with this gas business. The minute you get into dealing with it you will find that the gas business is to an extent a monopoly. My good friend the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) has had a lot of dealings with this problem, and he knows there are certain monopoly features to it, but probably there are competitive features to it, too. The gas companies have to compete with Hydro, the gas companies have to compete with coal and with oil, and, indeed, with wood, with all other forms of fuel.

(TAKE "C" FOLLOWS)

And the gas company cannot depart, with any safety, from an economic standpoint, from the usual levels which apply.

After all, oil in this City is definitely a competing feature to gas, and unless the convenience lies with gas, if the cost of gas outweighs the convenience people will get their oil, or turn to other fuel. That has been the experience in south-western Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the difference between these companies is, roughly, that in Southwestern Ontario the companies can be regulated and investigated by the official referee, or the natural Gas Commissioner, appointed under our Act. In the City of Toronto, it is quite correct - as the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) said, that this Act we are dealing with is a public Act, having its commencement 103 years ago, in 1848, in the City of Toronto, when Toronto was simply a little town. Those were the days, of course, before great public utilities came into being, and I am frank in saying that the type of legislation of 1848, and the amendments -- some by private bills, some by additions and changes by ways of letters patent -- may be, and probably are, in some respects, out-dated in its form.

I would say frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the government is studying all angles of things. In the last year you have the pipe line project from Windsor and Niagara Falls to Toronto, and from Toronto down along the lake front. When I became Minister of Mines in 1943, it would have been unthought of, almost unbelievable, that a gas company would ever come into the town of Lindsay and ask for a franchise, but that is happening today

because of the possibility of the importation of gas from elsewhere. All the cities along the northern shores of Lake Ontario which would never have thought of it, from a gas standpoint, two or three years ago, are now in the picture. Here we introduced a gas Bill and passed it, providing for expropriation proceedings on the same basis as the railways have power to expropriate in this province. We, of course, have to face that situation at the present time, and that problem is under investigation.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I state what was done with the Consumers Gas? Those who were interested in the Consumers Gas years ago made a provision that the Mayor of the City of Toronto should sit on their Board, and in spite of what the hon. members opposite may think, they made provision for very wide powers of audit, and if those are not in the Act, certainly the practice is being followed, because the books of the Company are opened to audit.

Last Fall the Company asked for an increase of 7½% in its gas rates. The Mayor of the City of Toronto, was a member of the Board, and he, himself, recommended the increase. However, as the result of that application, an investigating Committee of 9 members -- very representative people of the City of Toronto -- was set up.

Of these members, three have been mentioned. The others are Mr. Ashley, Professor of Commerce in the Department of Political Economy, University of Toronto; Mr. Henry Glover, of the firm of Henry Glover & Company; Chartered Accountants; Mr. D. K. McClelland, associated

with Price, Waterhouse & Company; Mr. John H. Ross, Consulting Engineer; Mr. Rybka, Consulting Engineer, and Mr. Robert Yeomans, Real Estate Broker. These comprise the Board, together with the three who have already been mentioned.

Here was the result: The instructions contained in the second paragraph of the letter of November 29, 1950, from His Worship the Mayor, -- which he had a perfect right to give -- outlines the scope of the Committee's enquiry as follows:-

> "The purpose of the committee is to investigate the operations of the Consumer's Gas Company as related to or affecting the proposed increase in the price of gas and report to the Board of Control as to the justification therefor, and indicate, in the event that the increase appears justified, any possible means of avoiding such increase".

The Committee met, and by agreement they split their inquiry into three questions:

1. As to whether or not the proposed increased rates are justified under the present way of operating the company.
2. As to the effect the proposed importation of natural gas from the United States would have on the present rate structure.
3. As to the effect upon the gas rates of operating the business of the company as a municipal public utility.

The findings of this Board were unanimous on the last two questions; they split 6 to 3 on the first question.

The hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) says there is a great deal of verbiage in that Report. The answer to that question is contained in just eight lines, which I will read to show that it is not, as the hon. member (Mr. Park) said, very extensive:

> "After thorough investigation of this question the Committee reports that in the opinion of the majority the proposed increase of 7½ per cent, in the gas rates is justified. The majority of the members of the Committee who are of this opinion are Messrs. Ashley, Glover, McClelland, Ross Rubka and Yeomans. The minority of the members of the Committee opposed to this opinion are Mrs. Klinck and Messrs. Brand and Lamport.

That is all it says. I will not deal with the other two, other than to refer to question (3) "Public Ownership":

> "The Committee had presented to it arguments in favour of public ownership, dealing particularly with freedom from taxation and economy in service. The Committee points out that it is not constituted so as to deal with the question of The Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto operating as a municipally-owned public utility but the Committee recommends that the Civic Administration institute an enquiry and study of

the advisability of the Company being operated as a municipally-owned public utility."

Mr. Speaker, that is a very reasonable and sound recommendation. That was unanimous.

As we sit here today in this Legislature, on the 14th day of March, 1951, we have received no request whatever from the Council of the City of Toronto which has this Report, for any action in respect to the Consumers' Gas Company -- and nothing whatsoever. They have not asked for any additional powers; they have not asked for any amendment to the Act; they have not asked for anything. I do not know that the Council has taken any further steps to follow up the Committee's recommendations, and see if these should be investigated from the standpoint of making it a public utility. We have received no communication, as far as I am aware, from the Mayor or the Council of the City of Toronto.

So much for the Report.

I want to turn now to another matter. I was interested in this, and I wanted to get the best information possible for the hon. members of the House relative to this problem, and, quite frankly, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I did it from this standpoint; that we realize we will probably have to deal with this problem on a proper basis, because it will involve the rest of the province of Ontario and involve interests which evidently have not come into the picture at all.

What I am giving here, the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and the hon. member for St.David

(Mr. Dennison) could have acquainted themselves with, if they wanted to, and if they had acquainted themselves with this, they could have saved the consumers of the City of Toronto a great deal of money. They have not done that, so I will show them how they sould have contributed toward preventing an increase of the cost to the consumers of the City of Toronto.

When I received this information, I thought I would have it multigraphed, in order that all the hon. members could have it, so I will paraphrase what I am going to say.

The authorized capital, authorized by a supplementary letters patent in 1928, was twenty-five million dollars, ($25,000,000) and the issued capital, $14,000,000 -- in round figures.

The method or sale was that shares were to be sold either by public auction or by tender after three weeks notice in two of the daily newspapers published in the City of Toronto.

The return to investors is that, under the Company's Act of incorporation, dated March 23rd, 1848, it makes provision for the payment of dividends at a rate not exceeding 10% per annum.

The rate of dividend in the first quarter of 1941 was reduced. During the past 10 years, dividends have been paid at the annual rate of 8% on the par value of the paid-up capital, a reduction of 20% from the maximum rate provided in the statute. This reduction in dividend payments can be regarded as a contribution by the shareholders toward meeting the greatly increased

costs of operation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to point out at this stage that while the Act of 1848 set a rate of 10% on par value, and while in 1941 it was reduced to 8% on the par value, "par value", after all is only what the public themselves have set and appraised as the value. They have set a value, not at $100. per share, but at $201. per share. So that 10% on the $100. becomes a very much different figure on the basis that the Company appraised it themselves. That is the point the hon. members opposite skated around.

MR. DENNISON: That is the proposal I made.

MR. FROST: Purchasers of shares have been induced to pay substantial premiums in the expectation that they would receive on the par value of their shares a rate of dividend not exceeding 10% per annum as specified in the statute incorporating the Company.

For instance, at the last sale of shares, which was held in February, 1937, the average price paid by the purchasers was $201.154 per $100. par value. The average return to the purchasers would be, at the maximum dividend rate of 10%, 4.97% and at the current dividend rate of 8%, 3.98%.

Going back over a period of time, perhaps 75 years, if we accepted the proposal of the hon. members opposite to make it 3%, the return would be something less than 1½% on money which these people have actually paid in.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Who said anything a bout 3%

MR. SALSBERG: I did.

MR. FROST: You heard the confession?

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is not in this Bill.

MR. FROST: I will deal with you in a moment. You said: "5%", which is something less than 2½%. Will somebody please tell me where I can borrow money at 2½%. I would certainly like to know that.

MR. SALSBERG: I will tell you where you can get it.

MR. DENNISON: The City of Toronto has borrowed at 2½%.

MR. FROST: Oh, I can borrow money for a year at 1¾ or 2½%, but these would be for gas mains, and things of that kind, and I could not borrow money at 2½% even with all the resources of the province of Ontario behind it.

A more silly suggestion was never advanced in this Legislature than came from the two groups sitting opposite in the Legislature.

I hope the hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail) will not leave her place, as I want to refer to wc in a moment, and there is something here that will be of interest to her. With a par value of thirteen and one half million dollars, the yield to the investors, men and women, at the current dividend rate of 8%, amounts to a little over 4%.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, you cannot get capital of a risk nature like that in the province of Ontario, even at those rates.

The record of all sales of shares since 1887,-- and the hon. member for St.David (Mr. Dennison) did not

want to go into this -- showed a par value of thirteen and one-half million dollars, the premium paid, which was in the Treasury, and represented by buildings, mains, and things of that sort, was nearly eight and one-half million dollars. The total proceeds of sale were about twenty-two million dollars, at an average price of approximately $161.00.

At the present rate of 8% -- averaging it back to those days in 1887 -- it amounts to 4.95%; on the basis of the last sales of stock in 1937, it is 3.89%.

I notice the hon. member for East York (Miss MacPhail) has gone out, but who are the shareholders in this concern?

MR. SALSBERG: Widows and orphans. It is the old story.

MR. FROST: Are they the big people? Are these held by big concerns and companies?

MR. SALSBERG: No.

MR. FROST: There is a total of 5221 shareholders, and of that number, 1359 are men and 2843 are women. In other words, the hon. members opposite who talk about the "rights of women" will be clipping the value of those shares, just taking a pair of scissors and running through them, as it were, and 2843 women in this province will, under their proposal, have their holdings cut in two.

MR. SALSBERG: You clipped them --

MR. FROST: Part of the income goes to the major charitable undertakings of a private nature, in this province, who hold a total of 1019, making a

total of 5221 shares.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the fact of this proposed 5% amendment, as proposed by the hon. members opposite, would have the effect of confiscating 1/5 of the value of the property owned by 2843 women in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, in speaking about "political immaturity", and the fact is that any government has to stand in the way of silly Bills which would wreck this Province, and I think this is a first class example of it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Deputy Speaker, we find further in the Company's undertakings that in 1937 and following there were no further sales of stock to the people at premium, or otherwise. I am sure the hon. member in the center group opposite will appreciate this; I am sure the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) will appreciate this, and I am sure the financial critic, if he were here (Mr. Brown) would appreciate it, and I know the Acting Leader of the Liberal Party, the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) will appreciate this, when I say that when income tax rates began soaring after the start of World War II, it became obvious that raising capital by the sale of common shares was the most expensive procedure, since the amount of the dividend to be paid on such shares formed part of the taxable income of the Company.

Therefore, in order to pay dividends, they had to pay an enormous tax to the government. On the other hand, interest on borrowed money is considered

an expense, or an inescapable obligation of the Company, and is not included in the taxable income.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, there are thousands of people in the City of Toronto today who want gas and cannot get it, because the Company requires financing in order to do it.

I notice the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr.Park) laughs. He will have cause to laugh when we get down to some of the things he has done, but I do not think the people who would be affected by this Bill will have very much to laugh about.

(TAKE "D" FOLLOWS)

On the other hand, interest on borrowed money is considered an expense as an inescapable obligation of the Company and is not included for taxable income purposes. If the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) were the auditor of the Company he would point that out to any concern in order to provide necessary capital for plant expenses. The Company in 1947 applied for and obtained supplementary letters patent authorizing the directors to issue bonds, debentures or other securities to a total amount not exceeding the par value of all of the shares of capital stock issued or outstanding in April 1948. The Company sold debentures to the extent of $5,000,000 at a coupon rate of 3 3/8%, the resulting interest cost to the company is equal to 98.5 on principal amount and to 3.42 on the capital raise. Now, if the Company sold shares of capital stock to obtain $5,000,000 the price would have been, would have to have been approximately $145. per $100. par value. At this price the return for the investor at the maximum divident rate of 10% would be this 9% and the current dividend rate of 8% on return would be 5.52%. Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, --

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Who said that?

MR. FROST: This is a company book, this is from the company's book.

MR. SALSBERG: That is a company's statement you are reading?

MR. FROST: Yes, from the books of the Company. These statements are no doubt positively correct, they are subject to audit by the City of Toronto and by their auditors. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what this means. First, when the hon.

members of the official Opposition without any regard for the facts of the amount people have paid for the shares and the amount of money that has gone into the Treasury of this Company would arbitrarily take and cut that right down from 10%, and there again the rate of 8% or the rate being paid on par value now, cut it down to 5%, which would immediately depress the value of the shares, would immediately cut the shares that people paid $201. for down to $150., something of that sort. It would mean that the rate of 3%, less than 4%, would be cut into perhaps 2¼% or 2½%. That would be the first effect with no compensation whatever. The money that these people have invested and put into the Company would be gone. Now, how about the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)?

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, he is all right.

MR. FROST: I suppose he counts on being treasurer of the province some day when his party gets into power, about 2050. If he lives that lon,g what would happen?

MR. MACLEOD: Oh, never mind, we will get in some time.

MR. FROST: This company cannot borrow money at 3%, Mr. Speaker, why, the province of Ontario cannot borrow money at 3%, how in the world would you expect --

MR. SALSBERG: That is because you are the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. FROST: How could he expect to borrow money at 3%?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: And provide necessary funds for the extension of service here in the City of Toronto. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to give you an example of the immaturity and

and extreme foolishness of the hon. members opposite. The things they do, I do not think they do them intentionally, I think they do these things because they do not know any better. This Company last year wanted to borrow $5,000,000 in order to provide extensions of mains and lines and service here in the City of Toronto. At that time the company could have borrowed $5,000,000 at a coupon rate of 3 1/8%, the effective rate would have been around 3.2%. Due to the fact that there were certain people who intervened, I think perhaps thoughtlessly, because I do not think this is the way to do it, they intervened thoughtlessly in the City of Toronto, and these debentures could not be sold.

MR. PARK: That is the Mayor of Toronto you speak of, not us.

MR. FROST: Wait a minute, they could not be sold and along comes the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) and he sends in his little bill, and along comes the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg), they cannot keep their nose out of this, the debentures for $5,000,000 still are not sold and the Company instead of being able to get the money at 3 1/8% must pay 3 3/8%, 3.46% for the embattled users of gas in this City of Toronto. In other words, this meddling business, without any regard for any reason or logic, this meddling business has cost every consumer in the city of Toronto the difference between 3.2% and 3.46%.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Nonsense.

MR. FROST: Well, that is the truth, that is the fact. Now, the fact is this, the longer the Bills stand here the more the poor old consumers in Toronto are going to pay.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why do they stand so long?

MR. FROST: I think this Bill should be off the Order Paper and those people who need service and gas in the city of Toronto should get it. That is the situation, Mr. Speaker. I want to again reiterate what I said at the outset. The proper method, of course, to approach this problem is this, if the city of Toronto feels that its Mayor being on the Board and their powers of audit are not sufficient, the city of Toronto can come here with a proposal that this company and other companies may be brought under some of the public utility Acts. That is the principle approach, Mr. Speaker, and that is the approach that the government of Ontario proposes to make to this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is quite unacceptable and the resolution is quite unacceptable. I have no intention of speaking on the resolution.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) began his speech on this Bill by a very interesting discussion of the position of natural gas companies in other parts of Ontario. Now, of course, that was all of interest but it had nothing to do with this Bill. I suggest to the House the position of the other gas companies he mentioned is quite different from that of the Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto and I propose to direct my remarks to the problem of the Toronto company. Now, as has been explained, the original Act was enacted in 1848 and I think the government can be cleared of responsibility for that particular Act. It has been on the Statute books for a long time. I must add, that if there are hazards ahead for those municipalities which might advance into this field either directly or

indirectly and I agree with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that there are hazards ahead in this field. That can hardly be said of the Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto which has been established for a very long time and which does necessarily enjoy a monopoly position as a supplier of gas in the city of Toronto. If future developments such as importation of natural gas into this area were to make a change it would be a change in favour of the Consumers' Gas Company rather than against its interests because it would mean the gas would be brought here by the Consumers' Gas Company because its cost would be less than the present gas that is used here. I think the actual practical result would probably be that we would be using, in the event of that development, we would be using a mixture of natural gas and manufactured gas. Now, there are two principles in this Bill. One of them is that information should be available to the city of Toronto. I notice that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) did not say much about that principle.

MR. FROST: We have never been asked by the city of Toronto to do that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) may not have been asked to do it, there may be many reasons for that policy, that failure to make that request but it is well known that the question of accessibility to the company's books and records was an issue in the city of Toronto and was only settled in part by a kind of compromise under which a committee went into the matter with the company. But, on that first principle I do not see how there can be any room for disagreement, I do not see how anyone in this House can argue that a public utility in a position of monopoly should

not make available to the city with complete freedom, all the books and records.

MR. FROST: Does the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) know of anything that has not been made available? We have no complaints, nothing.

MR. JOLLIFFE: There may be no complaints but it certainly was an issue of some heat in Toronto some time ago. Now, the other principle involved is that the dividend of the company should be limited. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has made great play of the fact, with regard to the last issue of capital stock, that the 10% ceiling on dividends had given rise to a great appreciation in the value of the stock insofar as the market and the public were concerned with the result that a premium reached the treasury of the company -- and the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) whole argument as I understand it is based on the fact that this was a case where the par value of the shares was disregarded and the company received more than double what it would have received on the basis of par value. Now, of course, by the same token, in the case of some companies, not in the case of this company, par value is sometimes misleading in that the moneys actually received by the treasuries of other companies are sometimes much less than the par value. I will go this far in meeting the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) argument, that it is much more sound to consider the money actually paid into the treasury of the company, the money actually invested, the money the purchaser actually paid, it is a much better standard than the par value of the company's shares. I will go that far with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). However, I would point out that the reason for the enormous

appreciation in the value of the shares 14 years ago was not that the ceiling on dividends was too high.

MR. FROST: Yes, but did the company get the benefit?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The company got the benefit and it is perfecly clear that the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) argument does not go to the principle of the Bill. If the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) argument went to the principle of the Bill then, we would be out of court, but it does not. What the mover of the Bill did was to use the same language that was used in the original Act which referred to a dividend of 10% per annum and if that is right in principle but wrong in form it can be amended in committee to correspond with the realities of the company's earnings' record and its financial position. So, the whole argument of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) it may be perfectly valid from the point of view of amending the language so that the limitation would be 5% on what the investor had actually paid. I would agree with that entirely. However, he attempts to destroy the principle of the Bill by addressing himself to an argument which would only be appropriate in the Committee stage of the Bill. Now, the net result must be that he is by-passing the principle of a limitation on the dividend which may be paid by a company of this kind. Speaking for myself --

MR. FROST: I am talking about a company, not a company of this kind.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right, I will talk about this company and I say in the case of this company the principle of limiting dividends is the correct principle. That principle was in the original Act, it has always been in the Act but the ceiling happens to be entirely inappropriate which the market proved beyond any doubt in the case of the issue of shares in 1937.

In addition, if the principle is correct, it ought to be correctly stated in the Bill.

MR. FROST: Would you compensate those that invested on the basis of this?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, if the 5% limitation were on the moneys actually paid into the treasury, they would be compensated and that is the way I think it ought to be done.

MR. FROST: Where is there any compensation in this Bill?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am discussing the principle of this Bill and I do not mind telling the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) if there is validity in his argument, if it is a valid argument, then it is for the purpose of committee discussion when you are trying to work out the proper language to be used in defining the dividend, but the principle of limitation is one that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) attempts to destroy with one hand and accepts it with the other as it always has been accepted in the Bill. I feel as I have always felt that the proper standard is the money actually paid into the treasury, but if he is using his argument indirectly by implication to destroy the case for a 5% limit on money actually paid, then, I say that he is not performing any good service to the people of Toronto or the consumers who are interested in this matter or the company itself. Now, he turned to a document obtained from the Consumers' Gas Company itself.

MR. FROST: I got that myself.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes, dated March 7, 1951, and forwarded to us when the debate opened this afternoon. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) concluded his remarks with an attempt to say the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) has cost the

consumers a lot of money by placing his Bill on the Order Paper. If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) were serious about that he would have got this Bill off the Order Paper long ago. This Bill has been on the Order Paper since February 20. If his zeal was so great to save the consumers money he would have called it earlier. What is more, if his zeal were so great to save consumers money he would have forwarded this memorandum to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) at a much earlier date.

Returning to the memorandum itself, I do not propose to deny or dispute the precise figures that appear in this memorandum. Surely the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is not so innocent as to suppose that a document like this is not susceptible to cross-examination. I am just wondering if he engaged in any cross-examination. Mr. Speaker, I have had a lot of experience with corporate statements, I certainly have had enough experience to know that a statement which may be precise in every particular as far as it goes may be a highly misleading statement, just as the witness who goes into the box -- and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has had many of them -- a witness who goes into the box in his examination-in-chief makes statements correct in every particular but which are entirely misleading until you get the whole story by way of cross-examination. I am satisfied there was no cross-examination in this case. The statement supplied by the company does not disclose, for instance, how much the company's position has improved in recent years. First, let me turn for a moment to what the market thinks about it. We have heard a lot about the market, the market's opinion, whatever you think it means, it certainly means something.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

Here is a Company which came to the city a few months ago claiming they simply had to have an increase in rates. Well, what did the market think about it, before the company got that increase in rates?

Mr. Speaker, the market value of this company's shares have increased eac h year since 1948. The market value of this company's stock, both the high quotations and the low quotations, for the year, have steadily and substantially increased from 1948 to 1950, which is the very time this company claimed it was so hard pressed that it had to have an increase in rates.

MR. FROST: What are they?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will give you the figures. The high rate in 1948 was 153; in 1949, 169; in 1950, 177.

The low for 1948 was 145; for 1949, it was 148½, and for 1950 the low was 160½. This is the company which said they had to have higher rates.

MR. FROST: Some of the shareholders paid $201.00 into the treasurery of the company, and now the stock market itself only appraises it at around 160 or 170.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am well aware of what the hon. premier (Mr. Frost) just said, about the position in 1937. I am pointing out what the market thought about it is the last three years. This was the period during which the company claimed its position changed for the worse, and asked that it be permitted to have a higher rate from the public.

Whether the market is right or wrong, the opinion of the investors certainly means something, and is not to be lightly disregarded by the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost).

As far as the committee of investigation is concerned, the hon. prime minister (Mr. Frost) failed to read one of the recommendations which I understand was unanamous and it is a recommendation which indicates very clearly that the financial standing of the company, as shown by its own statements - and this document for the defence is one of its own statements - is not satisfactory from an accountant's point of view.

On page 5 of the report, I read a paragraph which I understand to be a summary of the recommendations, contained in addendum "A" of the report

(1)"In the opinion of the Committee, steps should be taken by the company to review and possibly amend certain of these regulations. They have not all been strictly complied with, and in that connection the following is mentioned."

And then it gives three examples. And it goes on to say:

"It would therefore seem that having regard to the foregoing facts, the position of the company in relation to the regulations under the legislation should be studied by the company.

In that connection, the Committee suggests that a special study should be made of the experience of the company in connection with the Plant and Buildings Renewal Fund, and probably expert gas engineers should be engaged by the Company to examine the fixed assets, furnish a report on the physical condition of the facilities and express an

opinion as to the amount of the observed depreciation thereon which probably has accrued. The Committee offers the opinion that in lieu of the 5% provision from earnings to be credited to the Plant and Buildings Renewal Fund under the regulations, it might be an improvement in the practice if the regulations were amended so that the company would be required to, firstly, write off against current year's earnings as operating expenses, all actual expenditures for repairs and maintenance, and secondly, establish an annual provision for depreciation of the physical facilities of the company based on the estimated useful life thereof, and in that connection to consider further the question of obsolescence of the facilities."

Then it goes on to say:

"Furthermore, the Committee recommends that the form of the annual financial statements of the Company be studied by the management and the auditors with a view to clarifying the showing of operating results and financial position to conform to the latest practices and procedures of the accounting profession. For example, the Committee thinks that the form of the statement of income should be amended so as to show more clearly the amount of net profits from operations after providing for all expenses and charges, setting out separately the division of the 5% provision

for the Plant and Buildings Renewal Fund as between firstly, actual requirements for maintenance and repairs of buildings and equipment and secondly, showing the balance remaining as the provision for accruing depreciation and for obsolescence of fixed assets. The Committee is also of the opinion that the status of and changes in the Rest and Reserve Fund should be set forth in the balance sheet so as to show the original amount thereof, nature and amount of any charges thereto, and the amount reinstated in the Reserve Fund through the medium of the Depenture Retirement Fund as authorized in 1948 at the time the sinking fund debentures were issued."

It comes to this, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the committee, although the majority may have felt that in the present circumstances a rate increase was justified, it was not satisfied that the methods which have hitherto been employed to show earnings and the financial record of this company was the best method available.

MR. FROST: I have a copy of the report, because I asked for it. That report was never given to us by the City Council and there has been no request by the City Council for legislation of any kind.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That might mean one of two things. It might mean, in the first place, that the City Council did not think it was necessary or did not have a

sufficient reason to complain about it, or it may mean, in the second place, that the City Council has fallen down on the job, as they did with the T.T.C. pensions. Sometimes these mistakes have to be rectified.

The statement upon which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) relies does not tell the whole story about this company; it does not tell how much the company's position has improved in recent years, which was emphasized by the minority report in the City's investigation. It does not disclose what a high value is still placed on the shares of the company by the market. Turning for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the second last page of the company's statement, from which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) quoted with emphasis, where it is pointed out that the company borrowed $5,000,000. by way of debentures, and the cost to the company of this money amounted to 3.4624% of the capital rate -

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

Mr. Speaker, I will conclude my remarks on a more pleasant note. I think the company is probably to be commended for that operation. They were able to raise new capital at a cost at that time of less than 3 1/2%.

MR. FROST: Those debentures have not been sold yet. They could have sold them two or three months ago for 3 1/8; now they have to sell them at 3 3/8 because you people muddied the water.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will just pay attention for a moment. The paragraph to which I refer is the one he read. In 1948 the Company created and sold debentures amounting to $5,000,000 at an interest rate of 3 3/8. As I say, this was in 1948. The cost to the Company was 3.4264; in other words, in 1948 the Company was able to borrow money on debentures at a cost to the Company of less than 3 1/2%. Today the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) rises with tears in his eyes and suggests the Company is not going to be able to raise money if dividends are limited to 5%. The fact is that they raise money now at less than 3 1/2%.

With regard to the recently proposed debentures which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) sayd they have not been able to sell because of controversy about the matter, I suggest that there will be no difficulty whatsoever in selling them once this question is settled. It might be prudent on the part of the Company to await settlement of the controversy, but it is quite apparent, even on the basis of the second offer mentioned here for

issue March 15th that the Company will ...

MR. FROST: They could have sold at 3 1/8 if you people had stayed out of it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I say that when a Company, on the judgment of the market, has substantially improved its position over the last three years, the City Council and other interested people have every right to question the need for a rate increase. After investigation it may turn out that they are not. It might be that the utility, in the conditions which exist to-day, is entitled to a higher rate.

When the Company's position has been improving it is perfectly reasonable for the City Council or anybody else to question the need for that increase. The need of it was questioned and as a result a controversy ensued. The Company for the time being was not able to dispose of its new debenture offer. That is all it amounts to.

I assume they will. They will get it at a cost of less than 3 1/2%, but with respect to the broad principle that dividends or interests paid out of the monies of this Company should be limited to 5%. I think the Company can raise money at a cost of less than 5%. The hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) argument, plausible though it may be, will not stand analysis.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST: Mr. Speaker, do you want to have a vote now?

MR. PARK: Let us have it now.

Motion negatived on division.

Ayes 25

Nayes 53

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Motion No. 4.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: 4th motion; Mr. Salsberg--- resolution--- That, in the opinion of this House, all privately owned Public Utilities, such as the Consumers' Gas Company of Toronto which operate under the jurisdiction of the laws of Ontario shall, in the interests of the public, be regulated as follows:

(a) Dividend and interest payments on stock and bonds of such utilities shall not be higher than 3% per annum, based on the par value of such stocks or bonds.

(b) Reserves and depreciation funds of such utilities to be limited to amounts actually required for replacement and depreciation of property, equipment, etc., essential for maintenance of the efficient services of such utilities.

(c) The government of Ontario shall have the authority to investigate and determine the maximum amounts actually required by such Public Utilities for reserves and normal replacements.

(d) When the income of Public Utilities exceeds the amounts required for interest and dividends, as provided above and for its reserves as established to the satisfaction of the government, then the rates and charges to the public for services of such utilities shall be reduced

in proportion to the surplus of such income, and that the necessary legislation be enacted to give effect to this resolution.

MR. J.B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I move Notice of Motion No. 4, the resolution standing in my name.

Mr. Speaker, now that every hon. member has heard the resolution read very distinctly and clearly, I doubt whether it is necessary for me to repeat the full content of it. I will, however, later refer to some specific part of the resolution which is now before the House.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation differs considerably from the Bill which was defeated a minute ago. I am sorry that my motion did not come up before. I doubt whether the Liberal Party would have been split as widely as it was if they had listened to my argument on this issue.

MR. F.R. OLIVER (Grey South): I guess we would have been solid.

MR. SALSBERG: I am quite certain that the Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thomson) will be convinced, and it will be interesting to have his public statement on this question, to know what side he was on, London or Niagara, and he will have to make a choice, evidently, on this question.

My motion deals with companies like the Consumers' Gas. In reality it deals with all privately owned public utilities in the province. My references to the Consumers' Gas Company will be in order to illustrate the points which I want to make; but the application of the principles of

this motion is province-wide and has a bearing on the consumers or users of services in almost every municipality in the province.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) on behalf of the government has already given the answer to this resolution when he spoke against the previous Bill. I want to say that listening to him I had a feeling that he had done a better job in defence of increased rates for the Consumers' Gas Company than the company, itself, was ever able to do. Mind you, the arguments were not at all convincing but he certainly did it better than the officers of the company.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that in the very near future the words of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will be quoted in newspapers in this city and in other cities of the province, to justify increased rates, by privately owned public utilities. We recently read large advertisements that the Consumers' Gas Company placed in the Toronto daily papers in its efforts to justify the new and latest increase in rates. In those advertisements, the company attempted to create the impression umong the people that their rates are controlled by the Provincial Parliament. In fact, they repeatedly emphasized that, in my opinion, to mislead the people into believing that their increases have the sanction, the approval of the provincial government and that their demand for higher rates should, therefore, not be questioned. I am certain that from now on when the Consumers' Gas Company, or any similarly owned private public utility in the province, will want to raise rates, they will be able to quote the

hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of this province to justify their demands for increased rates.

In the case of the Consumers' Gas Company, we are confronted with a monopoly of an unusual type, a monopoly which is a public utility at the same time and it functions almost as if it had divine powers that no one can interfere with. It is a type of despotic monopoly which is guaranteed by Legislation of this province increases whenever desired in order to maintain a dividend payment up to 10%. We are faced with a situation where the company is in the position of heads they win and tails the people lose. They cannot lose at any time. I would challenge the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of this province to show any other cases where a privately owned utility was granted any such powers, or given such rights, or provided with such guarantees at the expense of the consumer as was given the Consumers' Gas Company.

MR. FROST: How about the Bell Telephone Company?

MR. SALSBERG: I think the Bell Telephone Company is a similar case.

MR. FROST: Well, all right; there is your answer.

MR. SALSBERG: But at least there the guarantee stops at 8%. You are afraid to bring about any reduction here where the guaranteed dividend is 10%. There is no public utility ---

MR. FROST: It is not guaranteed at all; it is not guaranteed by any person.

MR. SALSBERG: There is no public utility, here or elsewhere, which enjoys such privilege as does the Consumers' Gas Company. I repeat ---

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Cannot exceed 10%.

MR. SALSBERG: Hon. members of the government, hon. Cabinet Ministers, have made interjections, questioning whether they are guaranteed; and one hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) just said "Cannot exceed 10%." Well, let me acquaint the hon. members of the House with some of its rights and privileges. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the material I am about to read, though it comes from the Statutes of the Province of Ontario, reads like fantastic fiction. It is fiction, almost. I am quoting from the Statutes of the Province of Ontario, 1887.

MR. FROST: It is not from Hansard.

MR. SALSBERG: Chapter 85, pages 344 and 345, where is contained an Act to further extend the powers of the Consumers' Gas Company, Toronto, and the following are some of the extracts.

May I, before I quote, inform the House that the chapters or the sections, before the one I will quote provide for a "rest fund" or, as they call it sometimes, "a reserve fund".

MR. DUNBAR: Cushion.

MR. SALSBERG: A cushion, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) suggests. Yes; a very, very soft and big cushion.

(Take G follows)

Then they have a section that provides for the establishment of a "plant and building renewal fund" - that is another cushion. And after carefully providing for the luxurious cushions they then proceed ---

MR. FROST: Hydro has all of those and more.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, I will come to the Hydro, Mr. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I will come to the Hydro in a minute. Then comes the following section, Section 7:

> "Any surplus of net frofit from any source whatever, including premiums on sales of stock after the rest or reserve fund shall have been established and maintained as aforesaid remaining at the close of any fiscal year of the company after payment of fees to the president, vice-president and directors of the company not exceeding in all the sum of $9,000.00 per annum --"

MR. DUNBAR: Nothing about superannuation there.

MR. SALSBERG: " - after payment of dividend at the rate of 10% per annum - "

and listen to this, --

> "--on the paid up capital stock of the company and the establishment and maintenance of the said rest or reserve fund and providing for said plant and buildings renewal fund, shall be carried to a special account to be known as the special surplus account and whenever the amount of such surplus is equal to 5 cents per 1000 cubic feet on the quantity of gas sold during the

preceeding year, the price of gas shall be reduced from the then current year at least 5 cents per thousand cubic feet to all consumers."

MR. FROST: That is a pretty fair provision.

MR. SALSBERG: What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that after they will have taken off the necessary funds for the "cushions" and after they will have paid themselves 10% dividend, only then is the company obliged to create the special fund which, after it reaches a certain figure, would result in a reduction of the consumers' rates.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a fantastic set-up that has no equal in the laws of this or any other province governing a monopoly of the sort that the Consumers' Gas is. The hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) said before that 10% is the maximum. Well, thank you very much, it might have been higher but it is obvious from what I quoted from the Act that they are not obliged to reduce the rates by one penny prior to paying themselves 10%. Is that not right? Nobody can come and defend such privileges at the expense of the consumer.

MR. DUNBAR: On par value.

MR. SALSBERG: Now, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) arguing for the company - because that is what he did -

MR. FROST: Oh, no, I did not. I am arguing in the public interest. You just cost the consumer here in this company a thousand dollars every minute, that is all. For the next 20 years.

MR. SALSBERG: Quoting from the company's statements provided him --

MR. FROST: Asked for by me.

MR. SALSBERG: -- and then shed a lot of tears --

MR. FROST: No.

MR. SALSBERG: -- for the widows and orphans who hold the stock of that company.

MR. DUNBAR: You are shedding crocodile tears now.

MR. SALSBERG: We had better start to build dikes because we are in danger of being flooded out by the tears of sympathy. Now, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you cannot justify such unusually high dividend payments with such a presentation as that given by the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost). He does not take into account -- or if he does he did not show any sign of it -- does not take into account all the widows and orphans who are asked to pay gas bills to guarantee a dividend payment of 10%.

MR. FROST: Well, there is no guarantee.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, yes, there is.

MR. FROST: Oh, no, there isn't.

MR. SALSBERG: I just quoted from the Act which the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) does not want to touch.

MR. FROST: Such a thing is ridiculous.

MR. SALSBERG: It is almost untouchable that Act. He does not want to have any legislation that will reduce it, and he does not take into account the families that have to pay the gas bills. The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) says that hon. members of the opposition just want to "clip" the women --

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. SALSBERG: -- who hold stock, but I say to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) that he and his government are "clipping" at a terrific rate women and children, widows and others by insisting on their continuous payment of such rates. And I say further to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) that if we are discussing widows and orphans, if we are discussing women I say the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) has a chance to show his concern for them when we deal with mothers' allowances. He has a chance to show his concern by favouring a subsidy for milk so that children will get milk at the rate that their parents can pay for. If we are concerned about women and children, I say, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost), then let us really be concerned with the women and children. Do not bring out that moth-eaten argument about widows owning stocks. Maybe it is stock left to them by uncles and grandfathers and maybe some that they themselves bought, but please, I suggest, do not bring that argument here, it is below the dignity of the hon. Premier (Mr. Prost) and certainly he knows better than that.

The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) made a big ado about the fact that they are not really receiving 10%, they are only receiving 8% and that some of them paid $200.00 for a $100.00 share. Well, what the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) is suggesting and what is implied in his argumentation is this; that consumers, the public at large, should underwrite stock market speculation. That is what he is suggesting. When a person goes to a broker to buy shares or bonds, he knows what the par value of those shares or bonds, he knows what the par value of those shares or bonds are, doesn't he? Sure he knows! And if he buys a $100.00 share

and pays $200.00 for it he is engaged in some speculative operation. That is his right, but why should the consumers be called upon to underwrite such speculation? Why? It is done with their eyes open. Certainly the people should not be called upon to guarantee a certain dividend payment to people because they bought a $100.00 share for $200.00. I say it is unfair. I say that it is almost criminal to insist that a widow who is living on mothers' allowances, that puny allowance that they receive from the province, should pay through their gas rates a higher interest because somebody speculated on the market and bought a $100.00 share for $200.00.

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is a logical man, he knows that such arguments should not be advanced even when he is defending a bad case. We are not called upon to underwrite such speculations. Yet the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) says that the interest rate is not really 8% because of their overpayment.

Then he says that you cannot borrow money, that you cannot get venture capital, for as low a rate as suggested in my motion, 3%. And my motion differs from the Bill that you defeated a little while ago. This is not for 5%, I asked for 3 and, Mr. Premier (Mr. Frost), that is not a "confession" as you called it, this is a declaration, a proud declaration. Yes, I say my motion asks for a maximum of 3% to be paid to shareholders of public utilities!

I want to remind this government that the company paid for scores of years nothing less than 10% every year. When it looked as if they could not pay, they raised the rates. It is only a relatively short period that they

paid 8%. When the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) comes here and says you cannot get capital at 3%, he either does not know what is doing in the Hydro or he deliberately forgets. Hydro borrows all the money it requires at 3%. And there is no reason why the person who invests in Consumers' Gas stocks should receive more than a person who invests in Hydro bonds, no reason whatsoever.

Can money be gotten? Why, the Chairman of the Ontario Hydro Commission will tell you that he can get all the money the Hydro needs at 3%. That is true. When the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) comes and tells us that you cannot get capital at 3%, he is ignoring reality or he shows ignorance of what the Hydro is doing.

Something has been said here about the Consumers' services to the community, the extension of lines, etc. Now, let me tell you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the House, that precisely because the Consumers' Gas Company is enjoying this unusual privilege underwritten by the laws of the province and guaranteed by the consumers of the city that they can undertake things which no other private or public corporation would dare do. For instance, if the Consumers' Gas Company, its Directors, see fit to invest millions of dollars in the extension of its lines to areas close to the city which may become settled by people, they do that. They will invest money in the extension of lines that may not be required for years to come. There has been this experience time and again, that the Consumers' lines were extended in areas that were not occupied for 5, 10, 15 and 20 years, but it kept the books balanced. They took the cream off and expanded. They did not have to fear, they did not have to

worry about the fact that they may deplete certain funds, because they are guaranteed by law the right to increase rates and replenish their funds and make the people pay for it. That is what they have been doing.

Well, I personally think that the Consumers' Gas and all similar public utilities should be publicly owned, not privately owned. I think that the Consumers' Gas should be a branch of the Toronto Hydro, operated by one management. That is a matter for the city of Toronto, of course. I think that is true of other utilities of the same type, and I am confident that this will take place soon -- and maybe sooner than a lot of people think. But while these companies are permitted to exist as privately owned public utilities, then I say my motion that is now before the House goes a long way towards protecting the public.

Now, as far as hon. members of the Liberal group are concerned, while they were hesitant in voting for the Bill that was here before because it was restricted to one company, I suggested to them that after a careful reading of this resolution, they cannot but vote for it.

What this resolution seeks to accomplish -- and it is really no more than a declaration of principle on the part of the Legislature which should later of course be implemented by legislation -- what the resolution does is, it establishes the principle position of the House. And what is that principle position that I ask the House to go on record for? It says:

> "First, that the dividend payment on stocks and bonds of such utilities ---"

meaning privately owned public utilities, --

"-- shall not be higher than 3%, based on the par value of such stocks or bonds; second, that reserves and depreciation funds of such utilities be limited to amounts actually required ---"

and I pause from my reading to say to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), and I know that he understands this problem, that I am sure that he in his heart agrees with the proposals in this resolution.

MR. A.A. MacLEOD: (Bellwoods): You can see it written all over him.

MR. SALSBERG: And now I read on again from the resolution:

"For replacement and depreciation of property, equipment, etcetera, essential for the maintenance of efficient service of such utilities; third, the government of Ontario shall have the authority to investigate and determine the maximum amount actually required by such public utilities for reserves and normal replacements; and

Fourth, when the income of public utilities exceeds the amounts required for interest and dividends as provided above and for its reserves as established to the satisfaction of the government, then the rates of charges to the public for the services of such utilities shall be reduced in proportion to the surplus of such income, and that the necessary legislation be enacted to give effect to this resolution."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the objectives of this resolution are not only clear but very laudible and very commendable. I say this not because the resolution stands in my name, I would say that if the resolution stood on the Order Paper under the name of any other hon. member. It seeks to give the government the authority and the power to intervene whenever it seems necessary to protect the consumers of a city when they are overcharged by a privately owned public utility. There is nothing wrong with that. The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) spoke so movingly about protecting the families and the housewives. Well, here is a golden opportunity for the government to provide such protection, in any case that may arise where protection may be necessary. It leaves it in the hands of the government. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), say, could be placed in charge of such a task.

MR. MacLEOD: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: He is, I think, very well equipped to deal with such matters. It will provide protection to hundreds of thousands if not millions of comsumers and users of services which today is not enjoyed by those people. And so I hope that the resolution will be supported, certainly by all opposition groups and also by hon. members who usually support the government.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the House that this resolution with but one change, namely in the interest rate, was put on the Order Paper by me in 1945. At the 1945 session, that resolution word for word with the one exception I mentioned was on the Order Paper, and a very unusual thing happened in that session. The then hon. Premier Mr. Drew refused to call the motion, or the resolution.

[illegible] the [illegible] of this [illegible] [illegible] not only [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): My, my.

MR. SALSBERG: I got up on a number of occasions and asked the hon. Premier (Mr. Drew) when he was going to call that resolution, and he said he would in good time. But of course the government was defeated, the session was adjourned -- prorogued -- and the resolution was never called.

I might explain why, in my opinion, it was not called. The Drew Government of that year was a minority government. It did not have a majority to sustain it in power, and Mr. Drew suspected that this resolution would receive the support of all opposition groups, which would have been a majority of hon. members of the House. Furthermore, Mr. Drew at that time did not want to place himself on record as being opposed to such a resolution, while he certainly did not favour it -- the Toryism within him would not permit him to ever favour such a resolution. So Mr. Drew dodged the issue, did not call the resolution until there was no House to bring it to.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the government has a majority, not a majority of support in the province but a majority of hon. members in the House, and so this time the present hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) does call the resolution. Well, here we have it. The government has said now what they did not want to say in public in 1945. They know they can defeat it, but I do hope that the opportunity will be given to register the opinions of hon. members of the House on this resolution which, in my opinion, is a very worthwhile declaration of general principle which would equip the government with powers and authority to exercise control,

restraint, over privately owned public utilities, and protect the public from overcharges.

MR. J.G. BROWN (Waterloo, North): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I got caught in the snow drifts between here and Hamilton this morning and did not get back in time for the vote on the Bill which was defeated in this House a few minutes ago.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): Where were the snow plows?

MR. FROST: We thought the meeting you were at last night had laid you out.

MR. BROWN: No, I was out too early for the snow plow.

MR. MacLEOD: They called you "Weary Willie" at that meeting.

MR. BROWN: However, I am glad to have an opportunity to say a word in connection with this resolution. I am assuming that the resolution came about because of some anticipated financing project on behalf of or to be undertaken by the Consumers' Gas Company either for purposes of expandion or for purposes of renovation.

MR. SALSBERG: May I, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member (Mr. Brown) will permit me to correct him?

MR. BROWN: Yes.

MR. SALSBERG: That was not at all the reason why the resolution was put on the Order Paper. As a matter of fact, the same resolution was placed, as I said a moment ago, on the Order Paper in the 1945 session, and it arose because of the renewed public discussion as a result of the company's attempt to increase the rates again a few months ago.

MR. BROWN: Well, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of whether that might be the motive or not, I think the reason for the resolution is to minimize the interest rate on stocks or bonds which may be issued by this company or by any other privately owned public utility company at the rate of 3%. Now, that might be all very well, it might have been all very well a year or so ago when it would have been rather a simple matter for this company or any other company to have gone to the public and to sell its securities, whether they be stocks or bonds, at this rate of interest or at a rate slightly higher. But I do not think that it would be humanly possible to get any public reaction whatsoever from an issue of either stocks or bonds under present circumstances on the basis of 3%, and therefore any application which the Consumers' Gas Company might make or any other utility company for the sale of its bonds or stock would meet with a very cold reception indeed from the investing public. This company as well as any other company must keep in line with the interest rates which are prevalent at the present time. Even Dominion of Canada bonds today I do not think can be sold at 3%, and I am quite confident that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) would find difficulty in selling Ontario bonds at 3% without selling them at a discount. How then can you expect a privately owned public utility company or any other such company to sell their bonds at 3%?

I cannot see any sense whatever in the resolution.

MR. SALSBERG: Hydro do.

MR. BROWN: Hydro won't.

MR. SALSBERG: Hydro do.

MR. BROWN: In their next issue, they won't.

The motion negatived on division.

Ayes - 2

Nayes- 76

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, is it in order to demand a recount?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall have to submit that to the House to see if it is the wish of hon. members.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker,. I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Continuing with the Department of the Provincial Secretary.

On vote 146.

Hon. W. ARTHUR WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, with reference to vote 146, item No. 1, the $25,000.00 shown in that item is merely a token item. We estimate that that is ample to look after the administrative expenses from a point of view of our own provincial staff, that in the event of any further expenditures being required, the money will just have to be obtained on treasury warrant. But why put in an item for $100,000.00 or one and a half million dollars not knowing what actually would be required?

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE: (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. Premier and Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) intended to say anything about this matter, but he is reported as having made a statement to the Toronto Telegram, and I know he would want to take the Committee into his confidence just as much as

the Telegram.

The Telegram of March 6th, which is what, a week ago now, published this report:

> "Civil Defence, a moot question in Federal and Provincial circles, received no mention in the Ontario budget announcement today."

I presume that is a reference to the Budget speech.

> "Premier Frost told the Telegram that at the present time he did not think a large expenditure of money was warranted. 'We have had no information from Ottawa that would indicate that large expenditures should be provided for', he said 'If a situation should arise, we can meet it then'".

"If a situation should arise, we can meet it them."

MR. FROST: Well, I was not talking about a situation in that sense.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You meant that in a financial sense?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well ---

> "Colonel Arthur Welsh, co-ordinator for the Civil Defence of Ontario said he would be making some financial provision for civil emergency when he brought down his Department's estimate for the year".

And that is the vote which is now before the Committee: $25,000.00 is it not?

MR. FROST: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Which, I take it, is just a rough guess at the cost of the administration for the ensuing year. It is a nominal figure.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not qualified myself to make any estimate of what the cost would be --

MR. FROST: Well, we do not know ourselves.

MR. JOLLIFFE: -- of a comprehensive programme of civil defence, or of a half-way programme which, in my opinion, is not much better than having none at all, or a very, very modest minimum which appears to be about all that is in view so far. I do think, however, that the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) after the conferences he has attended and the very limited and rather ambiguous information he has received, is in a little better position than the rest of us to make a guess -- or an informed guess -- as to what may become necessary.

Now, we have heard that report the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) made some time ago, and I am interested to know whether it is being followed up -- that is to say, had the government taken any steps to inform Ottawa that the information disclosed at that conference on February 23rd, before that conference and since, is not adequate, because surely there must be agreement in this House that it is not adequate.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

I do not see how anyone could suggest on the basis of the hon. Provincial Secretary's (Mr. Welsh) report after that conference, that we have been given any significant or meaningful information about what the responsibilities of this province are supposed to be.

While the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) may be unahppy about this uncertainty -- and I presume the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is unhappy about it -- surely we cannot let the matter stand there.

I would like to hear further from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) or the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) or both, as to what they propose to do now. I do not believe for one minute that a single hon.member of this House was satisfied with the information which was disclosed. Probably that is not the fault of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh), but there it is. Why should we in this country be kept so much in darkness regarding matters which surely must receive more consideration at Ottawa than the reports to this House would indicate?

MR. WELSH; Mr. Chairman, in reply to the remarks by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.Jolliffe) may I say that after the discussion which arose in the House, I got in touch with the Federal hon.Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) with reference to this question, and I made the suggestion to him that he re-convene the Conference, and instead of having it on a Friday when everybody was pressed for time, to have it early in the week, and give us two days on it. That gives us the opportunity for submitting an agenda of

what we think should be discussed, and enable him to prepare his agenda, and give us a copy in sufficient time to go into it in details, and come to the meeting prepared to give us the answers to the questions we are asking.

I know our thinking on this matter is the same as the other provinces, but we were very disappointed. On the other hand, I am not criticising the hon. Minister of Health and Welfare (Mr. Martin) because he was "pitch-forked" into that meeting without any knowledge beforehand. I know he is going into this very thoroughly, and the suggestions I made to him -- and I imagine the other provinces made them at the same time -- will, I hope, be carried out in the very near future.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Civil Defence discussion up to the moment seems to me predicated upon a political situation, and that is perhaps the worst feature of it. There has been no discussion on the subject of civil disasters. It is quite obvious that the question of civil disasters is as important as civil defence,is, in time of war. We have heard of the disaster in Texas when they had the oil explosion there, and the one here in connection with the "Noronic" fire, and in Winnipeg, in connection with the floods, but still there is no discussion along the lines of the problem we have with us so permanently. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) should make it clear whether he intends to go forward with any plan for civil disasters, the same as for civil defence.

MR. WELSH: I think it is very obvious to every hon. member of the House that the organization which has been suggested to various municipalities is equally applicable to matters of a civil disaster, as well as to civil defence, because a disaster, whether it arises from enemy action or flood or fire, will call for the same results from the organization, when one is formed. Their work in connection with civil defence can certainly be applied to these other things. That is why I am so anxious to get some of these matters we discussed under way, such as the matter of the standardization, and whether we have enemy action, or whether the disaster be from fire or flood, it still will be a disaster.

MR. EASTON: Will you give me the assurance, Mr. Minister (Mr. Welsh) that if there is no enemy action you will, nevertheless, conduct the organization along the lines of civil disasters? That is, if the national situation gets better, and we do not require civil defence on a national scale.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste.Marie): Mr. Deputy Speaker, coming as I do from the community which is most likely to be the number one target, in case of war, may I say, as I said last year, how vulnerable Sault Ste. Marie is, not so much because of the industrial plants but because of the canal. That is important, for this reason, that through that canal will pass 85% of the iron ore manufactured into steel used on this continent for war work purposes, or, indeed, for all purposes.

We in Sault Ste. Marie are concerned about civil defence, based on our experiences in the past, even when there was no attach on Sault Ste. Marie. During World War II I think we were the only city which had a defence programme, sponsored by both countries, Canada and the United States. There were over 14,000 troups stationed there, and we had an interceptor squadron, and about 60 barrage balloons, in case of an air attack. That same condition will become evident, even before war is declared, and we feel that Sault Ste. Marie will be the No. 1 target. Therefore, we have been working for many months trying to build up a civil defence organization for Sault Ste. Marie, and to date, we have been partly successful. We have a very capable director who is doing his work free, and he has mobilized quite a bit of help, but yet there is not the spontaneous acceptance to his request for more workers, and the reason for that is there has been no leadership given either by the Federal government or given by this government.

I am not concerned about the amount of money in this estimate. I think that will be available as soon as it is necessary, but I am concerned about the thinking of our leaders. As an illustration, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) made a statement that it would not be necessary to evacuate the population of the cities, comparing the situation there to that of an army defending a front-line trench. He said during the war soldiers never evacuated their defence; they stuck it it, even though they were bombed.

We have a population of 32,000 in Sault Ste. Marie, and very few of them are essential workers, except perhaps those working on the locks, and you might call those engaged in the manufacture of steel as being engaged in an essential occupation. But can you imagine the old people, the women and the children in Sault Ste. Marie not being evacuated to safety.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member (Mr. Harvey, Sault Ste.Marie) will recall, I did not say any such thing. I expressly mentioned the old people and those hospitalized.

MR. HARVEY;. You did, about two months afterwards. I had a note of it, but unfortunately I have not got it with me. The thing is it might be necessary to evacuate the people of Sault Ste. Marie, and they might not be organized, and they might be evacuated in a panic. I remember when they unloaded the first bomb in England when I was over there with the Canadian Army and happened to be home on leave, and half the people became panic-stricken, and evacuated the city and they were working in essential industry. It is a leadership and confidence in the leaders which will give the people of Sault Ste. Marie and other cities and towns the necessary morale, so they, in turn, could do something.

I believe the Federal government and this provincial government have not given proper leadership to the needs of these people who are conscientious about organizing civil defence in our City.

One more thing. I am worried about the efforts of the National Civil Defence Organization right across

this country. Why not concentrate on a priority basis, that Sault Ste. Marie will be the number one target -- or, perhaps the number two target, and may I say that you are not divulging any secrets to Russia, or any of its allies, because they know about them now, and Sault Ste. Marie will be the first place to be bombed, undoubtedly.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman -- I am not worrying about the amount of money -- but I do suggest that the government give leadership so that the directors in the cities which will be bombed will have no trouble in building up an adequate organization, as so much depends on it. But if you show this careless and lackadaisical attitude, the people will find it pretty hard to build up a civil defence programme.

MR. L.J.K.FELL (Parkdale): On Vote 146, Mr. Chairman. I, unlike the hon. member for Sault Ste.Marie (Mr. Harvey) am somewhat interested in the sum set aside for this prupose. I was interested in hearing the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) say that if this does not meet the requirements for civil defence over the year, he will make application to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) for additional funds.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

It sounds very hazy. It seems to me that $25,000. isn't a very large sum for the provincial government to set aside for even investigation of the problem surrounding such a gigantic problem and such an important problem at this time as civilian defence in view of the fact that the city of Toronto itself has already asked for a budget for civilian defence which will exceed the amount now being asked by the provincial government which is responsible for the civilian defence committee here. I think there are one or two points which are noteworthy in dealing with this question. First of all, I think those of us who have had some experience overseas in the last war or towards the closing years of that war saw civilian defence at perhaps its highest known peak of efficiency. I believe the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) himself is aware of it and witnessed the degree to which the efficiency in civilian defence matters raised to during that period of time. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Welsh) will probably agree with me that knowing how broad the field is in times of actual warfare and relating that broadness to what should be done when a problem such as outright war is anticipated or a state of emergency is anticipated will agree with me when I say we are not making adequate provision here. In a question of civil defence it becomes quite obvious that there are various levels and each of these levels will have to accept certain responsibilities and authorize directions. The Federal Government will obviously be responsible for the maintenance of civil defence by way of troops, armaments, air force and so on, the dispostion of these troops for use in times of emergency. The provincial government then

should necessarily accept some responsibility for inter-provincial organization, a correlation of plans between the provincial government and the municipal government and it is not too far afield, at this time, I submit it is not too far afield to suggest that now is the time for the provincial government to be in close contact with the municipal government towards the province, particularly as the previous speaker indicated, in the more important areas where we might anticipate action that the provincial government should be in touch, should actually form some sort of organization between the provincial set-up and the municipal set-up and begin now organizing those things which we know have to be organized on that basis.

MR. FROST: We have that now.

MR. FELL: You are not doing anything very effective, at the moment. As far as I can see you are not doing anything beyond $25,000 for purposes of administration expense to include salaries, travelling expenses and general maintenance. Maintenance of what?

MR. FROST: That was explained to my friend. That was the total amount last year. We were met with the Winnipeg flood disaster, that amount was in the budget but we spent $250,000. on that. As we go ahead with Mr. Martin, find out more of what is needed, it will be taken care of. The point is, if you put in $125,000. would that mean anything? Or $250,000? Actually, we are putting in a token amount of $25,000. and we practically say to the House, we are telling the House we will spend what is required the same as was done at Winnipeg. That is all we can do.

MR. FELL: If that is all the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) can do, I submit as an individual, I do not claim to be an authority on the subject, I would submit from what I know of the subject, it is not sufficient in this case.

MR. FROST: Was the hon. member (Mr. Fell) in the House when the report was given in connection with the Ottawa conference?

MR. FELL: Yes, I was.

MR. FROST: What would you do?

MR. FELL: I would say, it is all right if the Federal Government cannot make up their minds as to where the responsibility lay, if the Federal Government cannot make up its mind about national defence. If the Federal Government is not prepared to say to the province, "You have this much money as assistance, you have these prepared plans to ago ahead on that basis," I say the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should be in a position to say "All right, we know there are certain things we will have to do in the province of Ontario in cooperation with our municipalities and let us get that done, let us get some of these things done now."

MR. FROST: I explained to the hon. member (Mr.Fell) the other day when we were discussing this that we are frankly in great doubt as to what the Federal Government intends us to do. Do they expect us to go out and buy fire engines and stockpile them and do various things or is this merely a preliminary warning stage in which they are asking for voluntary organization? We are not going out to spend a barrel of money without any instructions from

the generals that are supposed to run things. If they tell us what is wanted, as I said before, we will do it but we are not going to go out and spend money for the sake of spending it without any direction from the central government and we have no direction at the moment.

MR. FELL: I would like to suggest this to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), since he has placed this on a military basis and said we are waiting for instructions from our generals. If you have a troop in the field and it is attacked by the enemy, do you wait for the general who is five or six miles away, or even further, to tell you to hold your rifle fire? We are in the field and we have to have some organization within ourselves for preservation, and we are making no plans for that situation at all. I would suggest if we are going to wait for the Federal Government to act in this matter and in view of what the Federal Government has said and done, we might find ourselves in a very serious position should an emergency arise. I say that this province among all provinces is one province that should be prepared to defend itself regardless of what the Federal Government suggests should be done.

MR. J. L. EASTON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister? You said you gave $250,000. to the Winnipeg Relief Fund, does the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) know I cam to visit him, I came into his office when he was absent, I spoke to his secretary, I left pictures of the Van Wagner's flood, I left particulars with him, telling him what happened and I asked for a reply by mail. I never received a reply by

mail, I hever received a reply of any kind and the people of that district have not got one penny in relief from this government. I would like to know what they would do for the people in that district?

MR. FROST: I would say to the hon. member (Mr. Easton), I appreciate very much what he did but we were very busy getting out sand bags and rubber boots by plane, we did not have time.

MR. EASTON: That was after.

MR. FROST: We sent out men, sandbags, boots, everything that was necessary.

MR. EASTON: You did not rebuild the homes.

MR. DOWLING: You sent money to Winnipeg.

MR. FROST: No, we sent the equipment, not the money, we sent them the goods.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): I may be wrong in my attitude about civil defence at this stage but it is my feeling that it is at the moment a problem which for the most part is at the local level whereby voluntary organizations band themselves together such as we have done in our community and to look to the provincial and to the Federal Government not so much for financial support at this stage but for their moral support and for administration. Now, I believe I understand from the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) that they did have a staff available either to have these organizations meet them here or meet them on the local ground to get the benefit of their advice and of their experience. I can see nothing wrong in inserting an amount of $25,000 in the Budget at this stage., feeling that this is one item of

expense which lends itself to the special warrants which are issued by the teasury board in the case of emergency. I would expect that if an emergency should be created that this is what will happen, that the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) will call upon the Treasury Board for further sums but at the moment I cannot see it is so much a matter of expense as it is a matter of voluntary organization.

MR. FROST: That is right, quite right.

MR. W. DENNISON (St.David): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is right, it is a matter of how many volunteers we have trained, how many people we have with the knowledge to tackle the situation if we shojld have a disaster, whether it be a military attack or whether it be a civil disaster. Now, this appropriation of $25,000. unfortunately, does not provide any extra equipment, it would not provide an extra uniforms, it would not provide -- it would not necessarily provide any extra volunteers and would not provide any extra staff for training of volunteers. Now, those are the things the province could do and I think should do. The Dominion Government may not provide us with uniforms and equipment but at least we can make a start on the training. We all hope that we are not going to have a war, that this third world war may be averted, but not even top rating diplomats these days are able to say we are secure. These days, wars start without any of the old fashioned declarations of war. Today they sneak up and stab you in the back, so to speak, and there is no declaration of war.

We must remember that in Eastern Europe after the first World War we had no danger of war because the successor to Czarist Russia had given back the liberty to the people of Finland, and Eastern Poland and Czechoslovakia and so on, they had been given freedom back. Now, after this war the situation is quite different, there is not a small nation in Eastern Europe that has freedom today except the only one which had the guts enough to stand up and fight for it, and that was Finland. The only one who has freedom today is the one that fought for it. I think while we may say we hope there will not be a war, there is less likely to be an attack if we are prepared for it and that includes military and civilian defence as well. I see the Province of Alberta in its Estimates have $50,000 in the Estimates for civilian defence, that is twice the amount we have.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs); It is flowing right out of their oil wells there.

MR. DENNISON: Their oil wells still do not bring enough money to make up the amount this government takes from the pockets of Old Man Ontario these days. You are not digging for oil, you are in there cleaning out his pockets with a steam shovel. I say that this province in comparison with the appropriation made by Alberta, I would say it would not be unreasonable to expect the Province of Ontario to have $150,000. in that fund and to be prepared to spend a good portion of it.

When we had the Noronic disaster I looked for it in the Public Accounts for 1950 and the Province of Ontario spent $19,255 on the Noronic disaster. We were

not prepared for that and it cost us a lot more money because we were not prepared. We will spend a lot more money by not being prepared than just having the money to float around on afterwards.

MR. WL. L. HOUCK (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I believe I have already spoken twice on civil defence, I do not intend to labor the question much further. I think we are losing sight of the fact in this civilian defence that this province is actually spending a lot of money in civil defence in regard to the Hydro. In Niagara Falls they have sworn in thousands or dozens of special guards and policemen over the course of the last three or four months and they intend to spend more. They have been erecting special fences and everything else and I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will remember that we almost had a serious case of sabotage in the Queenston plant in the early part of November. I think that is one thing we must be concerned with, sabotage rather than an atomic or hydrogen bomb being dropped in the Province of Ontario. So, I say Ontario Hydro at least is spending these sums of money on civil defence.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr.Welsh) is there not a conference going on in Ottawa at the present time pertaining to the important municipalities, on civilian defence. They are having a two weeks conference, I believe, which started Monday. I know Niagara Falls was asked to it, it started Monday for two weeks.

MR. WELSH: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) is confusing that with the course that is going on down there where the major

portion of the representatives are from the Province of Ontario. I would also like to say to the hon. member for Niagara Falls (Mr. Houck) that within the next two weeks we are sending 30 delegates to a school so they will be in a position to train voluntary organizations.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Are they provincial employees? The people being sent to take this course, are they provincial employees?

MR. WELSH: No, they are representatives from the cities, the Federal Government is paying for it.

MR. HOUCK: Have you not two or three men over here from London, England, at the present time who went through the disaster five years ago?

MR. WELSH: We have some people who were sent around by the Federal Government last summer. They were trained by the British people and also some by the Americans and those people are training our provincial people.

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Are any of these people who are being sent down to this special training from Sault Ste. Marie?

MR. WELSH: Oh, yes, Sault Ste. Marie have wanted some people down on that course and they will be given the vacancies on the next course.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

MR. G. I. HARVEY (Sault Ste. Marie): Any of those men, any of those people being sent down for this special training from Sault Ste. Marie?

MR. WELSH: Oh, yes. Sault Ste. Marie has already had some people down on that course. They will be getting some vacancies in the next group.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I realize it is not a simple question. I am not too concerned about the amount in the Estimates, provided we are assured that more will be forthcoming if the situation develops where that is necessary. I would like to make this suggestion before the Provincial and Federal authorities get together the next time. I would like to point out that, from your observation, one of the things of greatest concern to municipalities is not the machinery which is to be set up for municipal defence; most of the municipalities have gone quite a ways down that road. They have pushed ahead with their committee and so on. I believe the time has come when the authorities should be able to advise a municipality on how far it should have gone with its defence plans in keeping with the vulnerability of that particular area. I believe that we should now be prepared to tell a city such as the city that I have the honour to be Mayor of -- Port Arthur, we should be able to tell them at this moment with the knowledge we have in our hands, give them exact instructions on how far they can go in defence plans. As the international situation worsens, if it does -- we hope it does not -- then step by step we should instruct each municipality according to its vulnerability in any specific area exactly how far they should have gone with their defence plans. If it gets

to such and such a stage you should have your sirens set up; you should have such and such additions to your fire department. That is what the municipalities are pleading for. I believe even at the moment with the international situation obscure as it is we probably should be able to tell each municipality according to the area in which it is located that, you should have your defence plans carried forward thus and so. If you are not that far, you should step on the gas and get that far. If you are moving much beyond that we suggest you are a little too hasty in the circumstances. I believe that that instruction, deciding with respect to a municipality as to how far they should go as the situation develops, should come from the higher authorities because the municipalities are not in a position to measure it.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Chairman, I may say I think the Federal Government, in placing this with the Department of Welfare, the hon. Mr. Martin, took the right course. The fact is that civil defence has not worked in with the military end of things at all. I think the Federal Government got this matter on the track the beginning of February when they placed it with Mr. Martin. I think we will make, from now on, more progress.

I may say to the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) there is a great deal in what he says; but we are faced with the same difficulty with which he is faced; we do not know. After all, we are civilians; we do not know; we have to rely on the government and the department which should have the answers to those things and know what we should do.

We are must admit this, that this matter has been away up in the air. We sent the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) to Ottawa. He came back and reported to this House the next day. Really they did not give us any information at all; but, again, the hon. Mr. Martin, the Minister put in charge of that, had only been appointed a couple of days before, came to the meeting not knowing what the score was at all. I think that will remedy itself very shortly. I can assure the House we will spend, and I know we will spend with the approval of the House, whatever is regarded proper to do the job it appears we should do.

Somebody has said, I think the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Harvey) and the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown), that this is a matter of, after all, inspiring local enthusiasm. Surely it is not a matter on which we should sink tremendous sums of money. It is a matter of trying to organize and get the people working, in a voluntary way.

I may say we have not any idea of purchasing uniforms and things of that sort. It is good enough if p eople wear their old clothes -- the old clothes which your wife tells you to wear sometime when you are cutting the grass, or something of that sort. That is what this matter will amount to. Imay say to the hon. members of the House that all is not complacency. I was very interested to get a letter from the executive secretary of the Civil Service Association, here, Mr. McMaster. He pointed out that the Association in the light of world conditions, many of the members felt that a program of preparedness should incorporate the furtherance of information on

blood types and it is suggested that the civil servants of Ontario should, in the near future, be called upon to make the necessary tests which will set up permanent records of their blood types and so on. He says notwithstanding any emergency the civil service program may require transfusions, which are costly in normal t imes and that not only as a matter of civil defence but as a matter of civilian life it would be a good thing to do. We are making arrangements. That is a very fine move on the part of the civil servants. It is a very excellent idea.

We have made arrangements with the Red Cross, As you know, the matter of keeping blood banks is not an easy t thing to do. We have acquired, as you know -- and I will make a statement further about this when we get on the estimate of the Department of Health -- The Hospital for Sick Children for purposes which I will explain then. We are, in the meantime, using part of that as a blood bank for the Red Cross and, therefore, they will operate a blood bank unit, which we will explain later on. The civil service effort will be worked out in conjunction with that; so that, I say, Mr. Chairman, all is not complacency. We have thousands of people in t his province who are interested. It is indeed a fact that it is difficult to arouse people's enthusiasm. If people thought that there was an impending and pressing danger undoubtedly we would have a great many people flocking into these organizations. At the moment we must keep the matters alive, stimulate enthusiasm as best we can and get the best voluntary effort possible.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, with respect to this matter I find myself torn between sympathy for the government and dissatisfaction with the government; sympathy because of the difficulty the government has had in obtaining leadership from the source from which it is to be expected, but dissatisfaction because I do not think the government has been sufficiently aggressive in seeking leadership from Ottawa or sufficiently decisive in making up its own mind to accept certain responsibilities. It is all very well to say that we are only civilians and that we have to await advice from people who have military qualifications. If we wait that long, Mr. Chairman, I do not think we will ever get that advice.

I just ask the hon. members of this committee to put this question to themselves between now and tomorrow. We have learned, within the last two or three days, of a forecast of expenditures to be made during the next three years, I believe, by the Federal Government. Unless I am mistaken it forecasts expenditures of about $5,000,000. for defence purposes over the next three years. Now, what are we to conclude from that kind of forecast. Are we to conclude that the Federal Government takes the situation as a joke, that they are not seriously concerned about the outlook, as we would gather from the way this question of civil defence has been kicked around, or are we, on the other hand, to conclude that any such vast expenditures would not be proposed unless the gravity of the present situation was very much in the minds of the government at Ottawa.

There is just no possible logic to this thing; to propose on the one hand that the people of this country should mortgage their whole future and embark upon expenditures unprecedented in peacetime and at the same time to say "Well, we will have to wait a while about such matters as civil defence".

I am little encouraged by the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) suggestion that now the question has been placed under the authority of the Minister of Health and Welfare we may expect more progress. I hope the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is right. I repeat, I certainly hope so. Mr. Martin is an able man. I do not suppose that he would be inclined to let it slide; but, at the same time, Mr. Martin is a member of a government which allowed this matter to slide for several years and did not even place it under Mr. Martin's authority until just before a highly important meeting with the provinces.

I am saying these things not because I want to make a political issue out of it -- I would like to go along with the hon. Secretary (Mr. Welsh) in his suggestion a few weeks ago that we do not make a partisan football out of the matter. None of us do. On the other hand, if you come to the point where that which ought to be done is not being done, then an issue has got to be made of it. We are approaching that point. We may not have got there yet but we are fast approaching it. I think the government should decide. I am asking for considered answers on this point. I think the government has to make up its mind whether or not it is prepared to accept responsibility for certain

matters of high importance. One does not need to be an expert to know them. They are obviously important. I suggest the government should consider making up its mind to inform certain municipalities that they are on the spot. The hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) at an earlier date gave a list of places which Ottawa considers to be targets. He added certain targets of his own. I agree with him. I think from my knowledge of the province that he was right. Sault Ste. Marie has been mentioned here today. We all know what goes on there. I am suggesting that the government will have to make up its mind that certain places must be told "You are it".

(TAKE K FOLLOWS)

And other places should be told with equal frankness that: "In your case you are not on any high priority, in your case there is very little danger to you." I know that may create difficulty because it means on the surface discrimininating between one place and another but I am suggesting you should consider the necessity of saying to places like the Soo and other places: "You get going on priority and we are going to assist you, even though we may not have had the treatment from Ottawa we think we deserve, even though this has not been dealt with as expeditiously as we think it should have been by Ottawa, we in our best judgment have come to the conclusion you have got to act."

I agree with everything said as to the importance of voluntary effort, by how much voluntary effort can be expected when this thing has been "kicked around" the way it has been? As I said before, there are thousands of people who will give you a great deal of time, energy and talent and every kind of cooperation if they are convinced it is worth-while but what is there on the record so far to satisfy them it is worth-while? Not very much. I think the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) knows that is the case.

There is one other thing that I feel bound to say and I want to be perfectly clear about it. It is sometimes suggested that if you talk civil devence or if you make an issue of the matter, that you are acting as an alarmist, that you are being carried away by the excitement of newspaper headlines or something of that sort, or it is even s sometimes suggested you are provoking and promoting the

danger of war. As far as I am concerned, I repudiate any such suggestion of that kind as just nonsense. I think it would be just as nonsensical to suggest that because the government or someone initiated fire drills in this Parliament Buildings that they are thereby promoting the activities of an arsonist. Let us not have any such nonsense thrust into this discussion. We should demand effective and adequate provisions for an emergency, whether it be an emergency arising from war which is possible---or an emergency arising from natural disaster, which is also possible. We are only asking for the wise wise action to be taken in the circumstances of the world today. And that has nothing whatever to do with other issues as to the best methods of avoiding war, which we all hope will be taken by those responsible.

I see the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) glancing at the clock. I am not attempting to get him to state this afternoon what he is going to do about this. There is not time, and in any event I would like him to think this thing over, and I would like to say to him that many of us on this side of the House are very unhappy about the present situation and we are not satisfied that it is good enough. We are not satisfied that it is enough for this government to shelve its responsibility because of Ottawa's record on it. Ypu might be excused for doing that if you are lucky, but if we are not so lucky, Mr. Chairman, no government would ever be excused for our unpreparedness.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST: (Prime Minister): Mr, Chairman, the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) and

myself had made arrangements to have a chat with hon. Mr. Martin about this. He is out West at the present time but on his return we expect to have a chat with him, and perhaps we can make a report to the House in connection with this matter in the next couple of weeks.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, it will only take a second to make a suggestion that I would like to put forward for the consideration of the government. I quite agree that under the circumstances it is quite impossible to determine any definite amount which might be required for a program over the next year, but I do humbly suggest that there might be an amount at least ten times larger than the present provision in the Estimates, and then when the program is decided and the allocation of costs is decided that at least the government would have an appropriation that they could reimburse municipalities promptly for the approved cost of providing equipment.

Now, there is one question about voluntary effort, that that voluntary effort and organization is of very little value unless they are given the necessary equipment with which to work. Somebody will have to buy that equipment, and I suggest that when the programme is mapped--and it undoubtedly ought to be mapped soon, now that it is in the hands indicated here today--but I do suggest that the government ought to have a sizeable appropriation from which they can withdraw approved costs in line with the programme they agree to under the circumstance.

I do not think it is proper to provide for a token amount and then draw a required amount and then be thousands out. You might better have an appropriation and then use that and more if necessary of if it is not used it is not going to do any harm.

MR. FROST: Well, Mr. Chairman, that of course is arguable. If we were to put in ten times the amounts, $250,000 and if we were then to get into the equipment business, that amounts to very little if the equipment to be stockpiled and purchased amounts to anything sizeable. And that again all depends on Federal contribution, participation, Frankly, we do not know.

MR. MILLARD: It looks more substantial.

MR FROST: Whether you put in ten times the amount, what difference does it make?

MR. MILLARD: It makes a lot of difference. Psychologically.

MR FROST: In fact, perhaps we should put in one hundred times the amount, $2,500,000. We do not know.

MR JOLLIFFE: My hon. friend (Mr. Millard) suggests it might make a psychological difference.

MR FROST: Oh, I do not think so. Remember last year at this time there was the beginnings of the Winnipeg flood. In that thing we spent in all $204,000 and that has been reported to this House. Those circumstances are unanticipated. Now, we really do not know. We could say $2,500,000 or $250,000, we have put in, frankly, a token amount and we say to the House that we are going to try to do a good job and we will come back here and we will, under the then known circumstances, report to

the House what the expenditures are and I can assure my hon. friends that we will not waste money nor will we be niggardly, but we will try to do a good job.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Vote 146 agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr Chairman, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes, Mr Speaker in the chair.

MR. T. L. PATRICK (Middlesex North): Mr Speaker, the Committee of Supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and begs leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr Speaker, tomorrow I would like to proceed with partly Budget debate and partly Estimates. Perhaps we can work in our hon. friends opposite tomorrow, but certainly I would like to clear up some of the Estimates. We will go aheat with the Department of Municipal Affairs next, and following that, Reform Institutions.

MR. E. B. JOLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That should be a good one.

MR. FROST: We can get those two out of the way, if we can, and go ahead with budget debate.

MR. F.R. CLIVER (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, would my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) not agree to proceeding with the Budget debate first?

MR FROST: Oh, yes, I think I would.

MR. OLIVER: I think so. Sure.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House

do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.04 of the clock p.m.

- - - -

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

THIRD SESSION

OF THE

TWENTY-THIRD LEGISLATURE

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

Hon- (Rev.) M. C. Davies, Speaker

Volume XXXI

THURSDAY, MARCH 15th. 1951.

And the House having met.

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting petitions.

Reading and receiving petitions.

Presenting reports by Committees.

MR. B.L. CATHCART (Lambton, West): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Downer (Duffern-Simcoe), I beg leave to present the report of The Standing Committee on Labour and move its adoption.

CLERK ASSISTANT: "To The Honourable The Legislative Assembly in the Province of Ontario:

"Honourable Members:

Your Standing Committee on Labour begs leave to present the following report:

Your Committee begs to report the following Bill without amendment --

Bill No. 80, The Boilers and Pressure Vessels Act, 1951. All of which is respectfully submitted."

MR. J.B. SALSBERG: (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, on the report which is before the House, with your permission I would like to draw the attention of the House to the historic moment which is at hand.

This report, Mr. Speaker, really makes history and it should not go by unnoticed. There is a difference of opinion as to whether this was the first meeting of the Committee on Labour since Confederation or whether it was the first meeting of the Committee on Labour since 1943. I am inclined to agree that it is the first such meeting which has taken place in this Legislature since Confederation.

MR. E.B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): It met in 1945.

MR. SALSBERG: That was a select committee, sir.

I, as a member of this Committee, feel proud, indeed, to have had the privilege of attending this historic meeting. I, as all other hon. members will, will treasure the notice which we received summoning us to appear at that meeting. The meeting, itself, Mr. Speaker went off as harmoniously any meeting of any Committee of this House; in fact, everybody was happy at the conclusion.

So, to mark this occasion I want to express my sentiments in a manner which will be remembered and take the liberty of forwarding a few flowers to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) so that he, too, may remember this momentous occasion.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Hon. C. DALEY (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, ----

SOME hon. MEMBER: Be careful; they're red.

MR. DALEY: --- I do appreciate the flowers and also note the colour. I think I should say that at this historic meeting I certainly did appreciate the spirit of co-operation and the attitude taken by all parties represented at this meeting, and that the results were most satisfactory.

In conclusion I would say, of course, that this government is always doing historic things.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SPEAKER: Motions.

Introduction of Bills.

Hon. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Mr. Kennedy, I move, seconded by Mr. Daley that leave be given to introduce an Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Milk Control Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the B ill.

MR. T.H. ISLEY (Waterloo,South): Would the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) please explain this Bill?

MR. GOODFELLOW: Before giving the explanation contained in the amendments to The Milk Control Act, I might express the thought that if I do not get flowers like my hon. colleague, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) possibly it will be a spray or a nice wreath.

SOME hon. MEMBER: A spray. That is what you are going to get.

MR. GOODFELLOW: The Bill which I have just introduced is intended to take the place of Bill No. 115, which was introduced a few days ago and which comprised certain amendments to the Milk Control Act.

Further consideration of the whole subject matter of milk and of the public interest has indicated the necessity of a somewhat broader approach to the problem and it has, therefore, been decided that these changed conditions could be tackled in better fashion by the introduction of an entirely new Bill.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GOODFELLOW: Under the existing provisions of The Milk Control Act a Milk Control B oard of four members will be established. The chairman of the board will

be representative of the producer, the distributor and the consumer. In the public interest it is desirable that representation on the Milk Control Board should be broadened in this fashion. In performing the functions of his office, the chairman will have a casting or deciding vote.

Now to turn to the Bill itself. Of major interest is the giving to the Milk Control Board a new power. This is the power to control the maximum price of milk to the consumer. The power itself is not new in our milk control legislation. The House will recall that earlier Ontario Milk Control Boards did not have power to control the price of milk to the consumer. At the time this power was taken from the board in 1948, it was hoped that free competition would set the price of milk. It is apparent on a commodity controlled throughout that this control must be continued in arriving at the price to be paid by the consumer. The provision of 1948 worked reasonably well but there are indications that in these days the present system will not continue to work well.

Therefore, the power is given to the Milk Control Board to prescribe the maximum price at which milk may be sold by retail in any market. This power will be exercised by the board only after a public hearing, at which all parties interested shall have the opportunity of stating their respective cases. In fixing prices in this fashion it is essential that every factor be given the fullest consideration. One of these factors, of course, is the cost of producing milk and of bringing it to the family table. Another factor, which, of course, will be given every consideration, is the absolute fairness of providing to all interests in the industry a reasonable profit for their services. This is fundamental in any free enterprise

economy.

The Bill contains other amendments which are designed to encourage sound competition in the industry. The machinery of the existing Milk Control Act includes provisions for collective bargaining between the producer and the distributor, which ensures a fair price to the producer for the milk which he produces. Once that fair price is established with respect to a particular market, the distributor may sell milk, under the terms of this new Bill, in any market within which that price to the producer is applicable.

Mention has been made of the collective bargaining provisions of the existing Milk Control Act. Heretofore, in the event of an agreement not being reached by the parties concerned, a board of three arbitrators made an appropriate award. This new Bill will eliminate the board of three arbitrators and will place the power of making an award in appropriate cases in the hands of a single arbitrator. This single arbitrator will be a judge of a County or District Court. While the wording of the new Bill is designed to provide for the necessary flexibility in appointing an arbitrator, it is intended that one judge will be appointed to serve for the entire Province. It will be appreciated that some flexibility is necessary in the Bill to enable another appointment to be made in the event of illness or some similar reason making it impossible for a particular judge to act.

Provision is also made in this new Bill for the continuing in effect of an agreement or an award as between the producer and the distributor, during any process of renegotiation or after the termination of an existing award.

This is designed to prevent the happening of conditions under which there might be no agreement or award in effect.

The new Bill will also provide protection to the producer and to the distributor in the supplying of milk. If a particular producer is unable to maintain his supply, a distributor will be required to make substitute purchases from within the group or marketing agency to which the producer in question belongs. Similar reciprocal protection is afforded to the distributor with respect to his right to purchase additional milk.

There remains an additional provision in the new Bill. In order to make fully effective the new power of the Milk Control Board to prescribe a maximum price, any increase in the retail price made after midnight of Wednesday, the 14th day of March, 1951, without the authority of the Milk Control Board will be void and of no effect. An appropriate penalty is provided for any violation of this provision.

In conclusion, I want to emphasize that these steps are being taken by reason of the grave and changing conditions under which we are living. It is imperative that by virtue of the essential need for milk in every family, price control at every level within the milk industry be established. It is just as imperative and just as important that these controls be established on a fair and sound foundation. To ensure all of this, the functions of the board in the fixing of maximum prices to the consumer will be carried out in public. All interests shall have the fullest opportunity of presenting their respective submissions.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): May I ask the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow), how this new Act will affect an announced increase in the cost of Milk in the city of Windsor which takes effect tomorrow?

MR. GOODFELLOW: In the city of Windsor an award has been passed and this will have no effect on the Windsor award.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow) might indicate if this new Bill will allow a distributor to sell milk at the store at less than the delivery price?

MR. GOODFELLOW: I tried to emphasize the word "maximum" because the Board will establish a maximum price. Competition will establish the rest.

GAME and FISHERIES ACT

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the Game and Fisheries Act," and that the same be now read the first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SCOTT: In explanation of this Bill I might say that there are several tidying up or clarifying sections involved. One involves a change of principle, shall I say, in section 4, which deals with the keeping of wild animals, other than bears or wolves in captivity and applies the same regulations as to their keep as are in the Wolf and Bear Bounty Act.

Section 9, the so-called "Buck law," is repealed. At the present time a party of two or more hunters is allowed to shoot and keep one fawn, deer or doe under one years of age for every two persons in the party. We find

that a great many fawns and does are being left in the woods. The experience of other states where they do not have this restrictive legislation is that the percentage of does and fawns killed compares very favourably with ours under this restrictive legislation and we feel that it will mean that the annual kill will not be increased but that the number of deer taken out of the camps will remain about the same.

In subsection 2 at the present time the districts of Rainy River, Kenora and Thunder Bay are permitted to use snares for the taking of wolves right through the deer season. We are adding to that list the district of Cochrane. Under the present Act the Department has no means of using any discretion except in those districts which are laid down, so we are making it permissible by order in council to extend that area if we see the necessity arises.

In section 12 we are adding the clause that anybody carrying a gun on Sunday must carry it dismantled or incased, as the Act at present provides for carrying it after sunrise and before sunset.

MR. SPEAKER: Introduction of Bills.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. H.R. SCOTT (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Goodfellow, that leave be given to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend The Public Lands Act," and that the same be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the Bill.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Speaker, in explanation of this Bill, I would like to say to the House that I think this really should be called "The Dempsey Act," because the

hon. member for Renfrew, South (Mr. Dempsey) has worked continuously since he has been an hon. member towards the end that pine on agricultural lands in his area should be released. There were previous amendments brought in, and, under those amendments, between 500 and 600 patents were cleared of the restriction,but we still found quite a few on which the timber could not be released under existing legislation. This amendment releases the pine on all land granted for agricultural purposes. We hope to see quite a great interest taken by the farmers in the area of the hon. member for Renfrew, South (Mr. Dempsey), in reforestation, because they will have encouragement to have pine come on,knowing that it will belong to them.

The only reservation we have in this Bill relate to grants made under The South African Veterans' Act.

MR. S.J. HUNT (Renfrew, North): I would like to draw to the attention of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) does not represent Revfrew County---

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SCOTT: I wish to apologize to the hon. member for Renfrew, North (Mr. Hunt). The hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Dempsey) represents Renfrew South.

The only exception to the clearing of titles is, as I say, under the South African Veterans' Act. Most of this was in Northern Ontario. We now find those scripts have passed into the hands of corporations or large companies. Any of those lands which are granted to the Veterans which have been cleared and settled as agricultural lands are included but not those which have passed into large holdings.

MR. J.S. DEMPSEY (Renfrew, South): Mr. Speaker, this is a very proud day in my life.

SOME Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DEMPSEY: I have been pressing for this ever since I came to this House. It is a measure to help the poor man, and any time we help the poor man we must take a great deal of pride in ourselves.

The back section of Renfrew County is rather rough land, but we have some good hardy individuals who live in those particular parts, who are ekeing out a living there very adverse circumstances at times; and one of the bad things I have listened to is hon. members of political parties getting up and promising that the farmer was going to own the pine on his own land. It is rather a strange thing to say, but we have a law down there whereby, when you get the deed, the pine trees were reserved to the Crown thereafter. That meant the future. The poor farmer found himself in a position where he was paying taxes on a whole lot of land and when the trees grew big enough, the other fellow came along and cut them. He found it difficult when he went to build a house. If he took some of those trees on which he paid taxes they were seized and the other fellow took them away. This has been going on probably 100 years. The new crops came up. There was alway a battle between the limit holder and the farmer who owned the trees.

This is certainly a happy day for me, when the farmer is going to own the tree. In our particular section of the country I am sure they will go in right away for growing trees. I am not going to brag but I think you will have a big increase in a year. A million trees will mean

5000 trees each for 200 people. That is not so very many. It is a light, sandy soil particularly adapted for growing pine trees. I believe this is one of the best measures I have seen since I have come to this House. I have to give credit to this government for the intestinal fortitude it has displayed in bringing in a law like this.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I was waiting for the question by some hon. members in respect of this matter but I am sure that every one of the hon. members is more than happy to allow the hon. member for Renfrew, South (Mr. Dempsey) the privilege of stating his views at this time.

Hon. W.A. GOODFELLOW (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Bill I introduced this afternoon in connection with amendments to the Milk Control Act, varied so greatly with the original Bill which was presented to the House, I would move that Bill No. 115 be discharged.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) like a division on that point?

MR. FROST: How would you vote?

MR. JOLLIFFE: I would vote wholeheartedly in support of the motion of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And would have done so on any day since the Bill was originally introduced.

Motion agreed to.

Bill No. 115 discharged.

Hon. G.A. WELSH (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following: The 31st Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the Province of Ontario, for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1950.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, will you permit me to rise on a point of privilege.

Earlier this afternoon, when the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) was offering his compliments and his flowers to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) I interrupted him to suggest that there had been a meeting of the Committee on Labour in 1945. It appears that I was not correct in that statement. I cheerfully acknowledge it. The meeting in 1945 I believe was a meeting of a select committee.

Having made that acknowledgment I regret that I must now play the part of a killjoy and deflate one of the statements made by the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and accepted by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), namely that there had been no previous meeting of the Standing Committee on Labour. I do this only because of my loyalty to historical accuracy and not out of any desire to wound the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) or the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley), or to deprive them of any of the joy they have felt today.

(TAKE "B" FOLLOWS)

But, Mr. Speaker, on the 27th day of March, 1944, it is reported in Votes and Proceedings, that at 3 o'clock p. m., after Prayers, Mr. Duckworth from the Standing Committee on Labor presented their report which was read as follows, it ended up by saying:

> "Your Committee has carefully considered the progisions of B ill No. 43, An Act to amend the Apprenticeship Act. Your Committee does not approve the Act in its present form and, therefore, reports the B ill back to the House with a requires that it be given further consideration."

That is one occasion, in 1944, when the Committee on Labor did meet and did report and found a certain Bill wanting. It would, therefore, appear that today has not been the only occasion on which a Bill introduced by the government has been found wanting.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to have the record straight for history's sake. I might confess at this time that I was of the impression that there had not been a meeting of the Labor Committee since I came to this House but I was not certain. I had a recollection somehow of attending a meeting of that Committee when the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) stated that he was advised that our meeting today was the first since Confederation I questioned that statement of his, but having no immediate access to the records I was quite willing to accept the hon. Minister's (Mr. Daley) statement for what it was. I am sure that both the hon. Minister (Mr. Daley) as well as this humble hon. member will be glad to have the record straight. We consider it an historic occasion nevertheless. As for the flowers, he de-

serves them and I hope he will keep them despite the slight historic error.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the day.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have some answers here to file and I have a little announcement to make to the House. I might say how pleased I am, Mr. Speaker, that at last the hon. members of the Opposition are appreciating the great contribution that the hon. Minister of Labor (Mr. Daley) is making to this House. I have seen many bricks and brickbats thrown at him but this is the first occasion I have seen him receive the bouquets to which he is entitled.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear. hear.

MR. FROST: Mr. Speaker, I have here answers to questions 111 and 167 and I have, I am afraid, some bad news for the hon. members. We are contemplating holding a night session tonight. This afternoon, we will hear two of the speakers from the opposition side on the Budget debate, and then I would like to go into Estimates of Municipal Affairs, followed by Education tonight.

Mr. Speaker, next week, of course, we are adjourning on Wednesday. I cannot really give the hon. members here five or six days holidays without imposing some conditions and we will have to have night sessions on Tuesday and Wednesday. I am hopeful of clearing away as many Estimates as we can. We still have some very important matters to consider in the House and I would like to clear away as many of the Estimates and the details as we can before Easter so I hope I can count on the cooperation of the hon. members. I know their speeches on all these matters will be short and to the point.

MR. H. L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Time and a half for overtime ?

MR. FROST: I will pay time and a half if you are a good boy.

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Order No. 1.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE: First Order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of Supply.

MR. J. G. BROWN (Waterloo North): Mr. Speaker, you were not in your seat when I spoke rather briefly on the Throne address so I would like to take this opportunity of extending to you my personal congratulations upon the excellent manner in which you are conducting the proceedings of this House and also to extend to you and to Mrs. Davies my sincere thanks for all that you have done for me. It is also very nice to see you back again in your accustomed place after a successful bout with the 'flu.

I think a word of praise is also due to the hon. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Patrick) for the very able manner in which he conducted the affairs of this House during your enforced absence.

A few days ago we heard another Budget address from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in his capacity as Provincial Treasurer and I take this opportunity of congratulating him upon what I consider to be his best effort thus far. Some question arose as to the establishment of a record for the number of budgets presented. My investigation would indicate that there is one Provincial Treasurer who is ahead of him and he is tied with the late Mr. Matheson who was hon. Attorney-General in the

Whitney Government so that in order that he might maintain a record I think it is going to be necessary to live out the full statutory life of the 23rd Parliament.

When the hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) was speaking on the Throne Address, she made certain recommendations that those hon. members who are qualified for the 25th anniversary club be possibly honored with the position of a Senatorship. Now, in view of the preponderance of Liberals in the Senate at the present time and in view of the vacancies there, I would like to make one more request and that is that after the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has accomplished this record , he ought to be made a Senator representing the Province of Ontario. My motive in making that suggestion is ulterior, because I know of no greater contribution that Prime Minister St. Laurent may make towards Liberalism in the Province of Ontario than to suggest that the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Frost) be made a Senator.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: While the obstacle is not insurmountable by any means, it is the only one which has the slightest hope of defeating the Liberals in the next provincial election.

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): How is Walter? (Mr. Thompson).

MR. BROWN: I want to compliment the official opposition financial critic (Mr. Wismer) for a very fine effort last Thursday afternoon. His rather lengthy reference to price controls might have been more effective had it been made in the highest seat of government, but no doubt it was designed to pave the way for considerable debate on the resolution which is sponsored by the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr.

Jolliffe), if, as and when called. As a matter of fact, this resolution was debated at quite some length just the day before yesterday upon the motion to adjourn but I was quite impressed with the figures which were presented to this House by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) in which he successfully attempted to compare the unit dollar value in 1950 with those of the year 1943 on the basis of 1939 values. While it is a fact that he referred probably to those departments which were least favorable to the government, I feel that he could very well have highlighted other departments as well such as Health, Education and Welfare because in reading over the figures which he presented they do not loom up too broadly from the government's point of view. Those figures, however, are all in Hansard, they have taken many hours to prepare and I do commend them to the earnest reading of every hon. member in this House. They are thought-provoking to say the least.

I want to thank the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) for the privilege which he afforded me in allowing me to have a few days after the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) had spoken because it gave me the opportunity to extract from my address certain things which would have been a repetition. At the same time, it gave me an opportunity to rather envisage what the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) might have to say as he succeeds me in this address. That, of course, is rather unpredictable.

Now, in commencing my address this afternoon I should like first of all to make reference to the Auditor's Report for the year ended March 31, 1950. At the outset, I would like to publicly congratulate Mr. Harvey Cotnam, the Provincial Auditor, upon being honored with a Fellowship in the Institute of Chartered Accountants, the highest honour

available to anyone from this body. In my opinion, the recognition is very richly deserved and it does seem to me it adds an air of distinction to have the balance sheet signed by a Fellow of the Chartered Accountants. I see that Mr. George Spence is under the Press Gallery, I would like to express my appreciation to him, at least, our ongratulations to him for the work also that he is doing in the Department. He is giving service outside as well, having been appointed as a Member of the Council of the Institute of Chartered Accountants.

Now, reference is made in the Auditor's Report to the new Audit Act. I was very pleased indeed that this Act was presented and was passed by the last Session of Parliament but I am not at all satisfied with the contents of that Act. There are many sections contained in the Act which have nothing whatever to do with auditing. As a matter of fact, their first section refers to the appointment of a Treasury Board. It was my intention at the early part of this Session to introduce a Bill amending the Audit Act but I was advised that the Finance Department in Ottawa in conjunction with the Dominion Auditor or the Auditor-General had drafted a new Act which is to be known as the Public Finance Act. That will be approved at the present Session of the House of Commons and I would respectfully suggest that the Treasury Department here and the Auditor get copies of that Act as soon as possible in order that they can finally draft an Act which will be acredit to the Province of Ontario.

It was rather disconcerting to read in the Auditor's Report a reference to the conditions of work in Departments and I would like to quote from Page 17 of his Report:

> "The even flow of work in processing accounts for payments is at times disrupted by a regular

"sub missions by the Departments. Difficulties experienced by the Departments in forwarding accounts for audit and payment are said to be due to pressure of work, lack of experienced staff, lack of accommodation, the scattered nature of the accommodation occupied. In my opinion, promptness in accounting is second in importance only to accuracy. Promptness in accounting should also lead to progress in diminishing the constant congestion at the end of the financial year, the evils attending which are well known."

The mere fact that the Auditor found it necessary to make such a reference in his report would indicate that the work is in a far from satisfactory condition and I would respectfully suggest that all hon. members, at least, all hon. Cabinet Ministers take this under advisement and see that every effort is made to bring this work up to date. I am not particularly acquainted with the details of the Departments but I would like to make a very brief reference to the position of one Department, that of the collection of taxes, or, I believe, of the administration of the corporation taxes. Now, in making reference to this, I want it distinctly understood that there is no reflection whatsoever cast upon the Controller of Revenue. I know of no executive member of the staff who works harder or who is more capable than is Philip Clark but the fact does remain that the corporation taxes where reimposed in 1947, it is now 1951 and we are just now receiving the faintest trickle of inquiry from those taxpayers. Assessments have not as yet been made after a period of four years. It is

definitely unfair to the taxpayer who has filed his returns in good faith and who if any additional tax is required will be called upon to pay interest for a period of four years. The same applies to the Provincial Government, itself, or to the people of this province, they too have been denied the right of this money for their own purposes over these last few years.

(Take C follows)

I would respectfully request that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) do everything he possibly can by the implementation of accounting machines or whatever they can do to get these assessments out and let the taxpayer know just what his posit on is.

In dealing with the accounts receivable, the auditor has this to say, after mentioning the amount of accounts receivable at $9,800,000 odd:

> "This is the net total of the accounts receivable of all Departments of the Provincial Government after the deduction of reserves for uncollectible accounts and includes $6,535,333.30 representing the surplus of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario less a provision for revenue stabilization."

And it is those last few words about which I wish to speak for a minute, "less a provision for revenue stabilization."

I think I am familiar with most accounting expressions, but this one is definitely unique. The auditor does not tell us the amount of this reserve, but I think it would be interesting to hon. members of the House to know that it is $14,790,661, or almost two and a half times the amount of the asset itself which is carried to the balance sheet. It is a reserve which is not required for any purpose whatsoever save one, and that is a buffer against reducing provincial revenue in the future, and therefore a figure which should be transferred forthwith to the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

Good accounting provides that each year should stand on its own feet, after due provision having been made for any losses in assets, but it does not stand for and it should not

stand for the withholding of revenues for future purposes.

I would like to refer briefly to the Budget as presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), in which he reported an interim surplus of $22,974,000 as compared with a forecast of $7,364,030 before sinking fund requirements. Having regard for the provisions contained in Bill No. 147 which was the last Bill passed at the second Session of this Parliament, it states as follows:

> "There may be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund a sum not exceeding in the whole $215,318,955 to be applied towards defraying the several charges and expenses of the public service, not otherwise provided for, from the 1st day of April 1950 to the 31st day of March 1951, as set forth in the Schedule, and such sum shall be paid and applied only in accordance with the votes and items of the Estimates upon which such Schedule is based."

In the light of that, I should have expected to have seen the surplus of this province for the year which will end at the end of this month built up as follows:

Surplus before sinking fund as per the Budget	$7,364,030
Surplus exclusive---excess of revenue over Budget	$22,406,370
Or a total surplus exclusive of lapses in Departments	$29,770,400

The surplus which was reported was $22,774,000, or an anauthorized total---and I say "unauthorized" advisedly---an unauthorized total of expenditure of $6,796,400.

Now, due to the manner in which Public Accounts are

presented, it is very difficult at a glance to determine just how much the lapses are, but I imagine that they would be quite considerable. It was obvious then that the difference between the surplus which should have happened and the actual surplus which was reported by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and these Treasury Board minutes and special warrants, and I should like to refer to this item at this time.

In doing so, the only figures available are those contained in the 1950 Public Accounts and in the Auditor's Report for 1950. By referring to these figures, I should like to read to you two quotations from The Audit Act. Section 13 (3):

> "If when the Legislature is not in Session, any accidenthappens to any public work or building which requires an immediate outlay for the repair or renewal thereof or any other occasion arises where expenditure not foreseen or provided for by The Legislature is urgently required for the public good, then upon the report of the Treasurer that there is no legislative provision and of the Minister having charge of the service in question that the necessity is urgent for the public good, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may order a special warrant to be prepared, to be signed by the Lieutenant-Governor for the issue of the amount estimated to be required, which shall be placed by the Treasurer to a Special Account against which cheques may issue as required."

That deals with special warrants and with which I am in complete accord. But section 23 reads like this:

"Where an appropriation is exhausted or is insufficiently provided for and the public interest or the urgent requirements of the public services necessitate further payments, then upon the report to the Treasury Board of the Minister having charge of the appropriation as to the necessity for further payments and the reasons why the appropriation is insufficient, and the amount estimated to be required, the Board may make an order for the issue of such amounts as it deems appropriate, which amounts shall be placed o the credit of the appropriations against which cheques may be issued as required."

Now I read those two sections of The Audit Act as an introduction to what I am about to say. I can see no justification for the provision in The Audit Act which gives the Treasury Board such sweeping powers as to grant to Departments substantial expenditures over that voted by this Provincial Legislature. I shall deal with some of the details contained in some of the Departments in a few minutes, but at this time might I say that if he present system is going to continue to operate whereby millions of dollars of public funds can be voted willy nilly by the Treasury Board without the approval of this Legislature, and a further amount of countless millions of dollars for ordinary purposes are considered as statutory, we as private members of this Legislature might just as well go back to our usual avocation in life. It is making a mockery out of the system of government for the Province of Ontario. It is denying the elected members the privilege of responsibility of performing the function

for which they were elected, and it is undermining the principles of democracy in Ontario.

This view is shared, I am sure, by the Provincial Auditor himself, because in his Auditor's Report, on page 18, he says this:

> "I feel bound to point out that, in my opinion, the tried and established system of accounting for expenditures from voted moneys b means of appropriation accounts is the most effective method of securing control of the Assembly and I therefore urge that this sytem be followed in any future legislation involving expenditure. Where, in connection with proposed legislation, any variation from the sytem above stated is contemplated I recommend that the at ention of the Assembly should be specifically drawn to the proposed variation, so that the arrangements may be fully appreciated when the legislation is under consideration."

Even from the standpoint of the government, to have millions of dollars voted b the Treasury Board is an indication in itself of carelessness and of inefficiency in presenting the Budget in the first place. We do not see a similar situation such as this in the parent government in Ottawa. They have a Treasury Board there too, but this Treasury Board is not a Board that is designed for purpose of administration, but rather policy. I would like to quote just a few lines from the Guide which is prepared by the Auditor-Generalof the Dominion of Canada, which illustrates better than I can say what I mean. Section 17 of this Guide reads as follows:

> "The Canadian Treasury Board meets, as a rule, weekly. Apart from duties placed on it by various Acts, the Board acts 'as a Committee of

"the King's Privy Council for Canada on all matters relating to finance, revenue and expenditure or public accounts, which are referred to it by the Council or to which the Board thinks it necessary to call the attention of the Council' the Board may demand 'any account, return, statement, document, or information which the Board deems requisite for the due performance of its duties', and may regulate the system or plans of receipt and expenditure accounts. The Act does not require each book of account to be approved by the Board. Payments are sometimes made by treating a Treasury Board minute as the voucher."

That is, after it has been in the Vote, as a voucher,---

"exception might be taken to the practise, because the Board's function is that of policy, not of administration."

To stick to the original Vote as a pproved by hon. members of the House of Commons is sacred, and the only thing that is permitted there is to allow transfers within the Vote itself.

MR. W. DENTON (St. Davie): Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: Special warrants issued by the Governor-General are permissible under only extraordinary circumstances, and it may be of interest for hon. members of this House to know that out of an expenditure of over 1½ billion dollars in the year which ended in 1950, there was only one warrant issued by the Governor-General of the Dominion of Canada. I would like to quote just a few words from the report of the Auditor-General under section 15:

"A special warrant was issued on August 24

"1949 for $310,000."

A, that is, one special warrant,--

"the surrounding circumstances were exceptional." And then he goes on to say---and I will not take the time of the House to read it, he goes on to say in just what manner this one special warrant was accepted, and if you read through the Public Accounts of the Dominion of Canada such as I have done, where they have set beside the Vote the exact amount expended, you will find in no other case has the Vote been exceeded nor has there been any Treasury Board Minutes or anything of the like.

I cannot urge too strongly, therefore, that the powers of the Treasury Board be reduced from that of an administrative function to one of policy, and that the Lieutenant-Governor be the only one authorized to issue expenditures which have not been contained in the Votes.

Now, before I deal with the Departments of this government, I should like to refer briefly to what I consider to be glaring misstatements of fact which can be most misleading to the unsuspecting public as they read through these Public Accounts. When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was chastising rather severely the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) during his--

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Was he chastising me?

Hon. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): You deserved it---greatly deserved it.

MR. NIXON: I did not know I was being spanked.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BROWN: He referred to him as comparing cows and pigs and sheep or some such like as that. As a matter of fact, this is what he did say:

"I would like to say this to the hon. member (Mr. Nixon). On his farm, would he compare pigs and cows or pigs and sheep? Certainly he would not, and he knows full well in this House that he would not compare ordinary expenditures and capital expenditures, and that is exactly what he is doing. He got out of the Budget of 1943 the amount of the ordinary expenditures and he compares them with the 1950 including our capital expenditures which cover the great undertakings of this government which has progressed so much under this great government."

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Hear, hear.

MR. BROWN: Now, I think the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) very successfully refuted that statement when he spoke, but in these Public Accounts we are not comparing cattle with sheep, but we are comparing elephants with rabbits and we come up with diamonds---very rich diamonds. The most interesting case is that to be found in the Department of Reform Institution and in this I cast no reflection whatsoever on the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Foote).

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bedlwoods): Beyond reproach.

MR. BROWN: But to those of you who have reviewed the public accounts, you will see there in a Schedule at the commencement of each Department s owing, first of all, the appropriations; secondly, the Treasury Board Minutes; and then you see the items of expenditure followed by the unexpended portion. And in the Department of Reform Institutions we find this, that the total appropriations were $6,336,900; Treasury Board warrants, $570,000; or a total

of $6,905,900. That is the total appropriation authorized and, shall I say, unauthorized. Expenditures, if you will read on page S5, amount to $4,503,494, leaving an apparent unexpended portion which normally you would consider as lapses of $2,402,406. There is where we get the idea of diamonds. Of course these are far from the facts. Were we to analyze the details of those amounts, we will find buried in the expenditures---not in the appropriations, but in the expenditures---internal revenue which has been deducted from the expenditures, and we come up with a very much distorted figure. How can you possibly arrive at a proper unexpended portion of a budget when you are dealing with two entirely different values? And that is what we are doing here.

While I have used the Department of Reform Institutions as an example, the same situation applies equally, except in lesser amount, to the Department of Education, the Department of the Attorney-General, and to the extent of over half a million dollars in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) own Department.

(Take D follows)

It is my opinion the revenues -- whether internal or from any other source -- should be treated as gross revenues of the province of Ontario.

Referring again to the Department of Reform Institutions, I am at a loss to see why disbursements in connection with the industrial part of their work should be deducted from the revenues, whereas the revenues derived from the farm produce is considered as gross. I would recommend that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) and his staff correct this discrepancy in the presentation of the 1951 accounts.

I would like to refer briefly to a few of the departments, in the light of Treasury Board Minutes. Agriculture indicates an estimate of expenditures over budget of $724,810.00, all of which indicates that "Old Man Ontario" was not quite as kind to the farmers of Ontario as he intended to be last March. And also included in the public accounts for the Department of Agriculture are Treasury Board warrantes amounting to $126,335.00. Incidentally, and this is rather trivial, but it comes about in my investigation of the accounts -- I am unable to reconcile the Treasury Board's minutes as declared in the Public Accounts with those contained in the Auditor's Report. The Auditor's Report, for instance, does not include Treasury Board's minutes for $3,120.00 for their seed-cleaning plant, $1,500.00 for Vineland wages, and an amount of $3,000 for additional equipment at the Ontario Veterinary College. An analysis of the Treasurer Board's minutes for agriculture -- and this applies to practically every department -- would indicate that expenditures are being made without regard for the budget figures contained in the votes, and having

over-spent, the Depar tment then goes to the Treasury Board for relief.

This is contrary to the Provincial Audit Act, such as I read, because the requirement is they go to the Board first. The Board will discuss it, and if they see that the Department is in need, the money will be voted. I will attempt to prove that is not the way it is being done.

To illustrate what I mean; 16 orders out of a total of 19 in the Department of Agriculture were issued subsequent to February 1st, 1950, and 15 out of the 16 could very easily have waited until the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) presented his Budget for the succeeding year.

Two of these items, one for $15,000.00, and one for $9,000.00, were actually issued on April 20th, 1950, 20 days after the close of the books, as of March 31st.

On November 30th, 1949, an order was issued for expenses for T.B. testing in an amount of $40,000.00, and yet the amount which was placed in the estimates in the first place to cover a full years' work amounted to $32,000.00. This item was $8,000.00 more than the original estimate which was made for the full year. That is to me an indication of extremely bad budgeting.

I am not singling out the Department of Agriculture. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Education and Attorney General (Mr. Porter) is not in his seat, because I would like to say that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Kennedy) is a "piker" as compared to him.

In a Board minute of the Attorney General's Department, there is an amount of $320,300.00 odd dollars, and all but $60,000.00 of which was after February 1st.

You cannot tell me that the accounting in those departments was up to date, or kept in touch with the budget figure, or this situation would not have developed.

I would like to know, for instance, how much traveling expenses in the Law Enforcement Branch had been expanded before the request was made, just six or seven weeks before the close of the books, for an additional $100,000.00. And I would also like to know why the Radial Communicating System -- needed and all that it was, and which cost the province of Ontario $80,000 -- could not have waited another 6 weeks to have been approved by this Provincial Legislature, before the expenditure was made, or is it possible that it may have been made previously, and the warrant was not issued until February?

In education, the condition is almost unbelievable. 12 of the 32 warrants issued on behalf of the Department of Education were issued in April of 1950, one of them for $612,520.00 to the University of Toronto. On February 24th a warrant was issued for a general legislative grant of $750,000.00.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am not questioning the propriety of these warrants, but I am saying that the Treasury Board has no authority to make such grants, and if justified -- as no doubt they were justified -- they should have been approved in the supplementary estimates submitted to this House upon assembly, before the disbursements were made.

The same practice holds in all departments within the Treasury Board's minutes, indicating they were spending like drunken sailors, and then making a mad scramble before the 31st of March to cover up their mistakes.

In the Health Department, 22 out of 29 warrants were issued on the 29th of March, just two days before the close of the books.

And I will not let the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) down completely, because while he had only one warrant, that was for $100,000.00, and that was stated to be for a special grant to an unnamed municipality, and the warrant was dated April 20th, 1950, 20 days after the close of the books.

Now, the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. Doucett) is not charged with any Treasury Board's warrants at all. His department is given a blank cheque for an unstated amount. His budget was for thirty-three and one-half million dollars; he spent forty million dollars, and as was so well pointed out by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) the other day, he needed no approval for the extra seven million dollars; as a matter of fact, he needed no approval for the first thirty millions of the thirty-three million dollars budgeted for, and all that was within the consolidated revenue fund.

MR. SALSBERG: Favoritism; that is what it is.

MR. BROWN: This Department spent close to seventy-three million dollars, and all the details found in the Public accounts are contained on one page, taking up six or eight inches, whereas, in the Agricultural Department, where they spent seven million dollars, it is detailed in five or six full pages.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, more could be said about departmental irregularity and inefficiency, but I feel I have said enough to indicate that there is evidence of extremely bad budgeting. There is evidence of apparently unnecessary

over-spending; there is evidence of the Treasury Board taking no steps whatever to curb it.

It would be interesting indeed to know how many formal applications have been made to the Treasury Board which have been turned down, and it would be equally as interesting to know how many meetings the Treasury Board has actually held. It seems to me this is the time to call another meeting of the Public Accounts Committee. The last meeting produced some very satisfactory results, and there is again much to be done. I would like, for instance, to call the heads of the departments, in order that they might give an account of their stewardship. It is their job to live within the budget for which responsibility has been assumed by the hon. members of the Legislative Assembly. They have assumed this responsibility when we granted the votes, and it is the responsibility, I would say, of officials, to see that these budgets are adhered to, month by month, and up to the end of the year.

I would, therefore, respectfully request the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to call this meeting. No motive need be given except to call the meeting, and to tell the members of that Committee that the hon. members of this House may be given an opportunity to review the public accounts, and become acquainted with the financial functions of the departments.

I would recommend it could be done in this way; this year, we take three departments; next year, another three; and so on, until we have completed all of them, and I think much good could come out of such meetings as that.

I would like to say a few words about budgeting in addition to care and fore-sight, which should accompany each vote -- but which I am frank to say I do not think does accompany each vote, at least up until now -- the hon. members of this House should be given more details, and such have the figures presented in comparative form. The hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) has been making this suggestion, certainly for the last two sessions of Parliament, and perhaps even before that time.

The system which is in use in Ottawa is not patented, and it is one which would lend itself very satisfactorily to the province of Ontario. It is one whereby the votes are shown in condensed form in the front of the book for each department, and indicates the appropriation this year, and the appropriation last year, with the differences, plus and minus, and the pages in the back of the book record the details of the votes.

I would like to table the estimates of the Dominion Government for the year 1951, and respectfully suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that he give consideration to next year's budget -- if he is still here -- on this basis.

MR. DUNBAR: Did you think he was going away on a visit, or something?

MR. BROWN: Well, lots of things can happen between now and a year from now.

There is a reference again in the Budget which has been contained in Budgets for many years regarding something which rather leaves me cold. I do not know whether I stand alone in this or not, but it seems to me that hon. members

of the official Opposition, and the hon. members of this group too, have spoken on this before. Whether they have changed their minds about it I do not know. It has to do with this item . .he cost of living bonus. The cost of living bonus was an invention -- and a legitimate one -- devised to overcome the freezing of salaries and wages, but with the repeal of salary and wage orders, there seems to me should have gone the suspension of the cost of living bonus. Generally that is what is being done in industry and commerce, and in looking through the estimates of the Dominion Government, I see no reference whatever to that item.

In my opinion the workmen is worthy of his hire on the basis of present values, and it is rather embarrassing indeed for an employee to feel that he is only worth so much money, but that out of the goodness of heart of his employer, he, almost in the form of charity, hands him something additional to take care of his rent, clothing, food, and things of that nature. It is a policy which has no merit in fact whatsoever, and, in my opinion, should be abolished forthwith by this government.

Might I recommend that before we proceed further with the estimates, this government re-allocate the figures which are in the estimate, and put the cost of living directly to wages and to salaries.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Budget presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) last Tuesday indicates a position of financial stability, but at the same time offers grave concern for the future. It was I who made the statement in this House, which was quoted by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in his address, relative to the possible deficit for the year about to end. For this [illegible]or no

apology whatsoever. I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) realizes that if industry had continued to lag in 1950, as it started out; if profits in 1950 had continued to lag as they started out -- in other words, had there been no mark up, the situation as of March 31st, 1951, would be substantially different than they are. It is most unfortunate that isolated war, and the threat of a third World War should be responsible for the buoyancies of revenue, as we find it today, but it is a fact which cannot be denied. So I offer no apology for my fore-cast, and at the same time I might remind this government that it requires no ingenuity and no statesmanship, to produce the surpluses to which they have referred, and the same thing can be said ever since they came into power in 1943.

I do commend the government for the policy of applying surpluses to a reduction of the funded debt of the province. The net increase has increased thirty-two and one half-million dollars, while the funded debt has increased six and one-quarter million dollars, and this must prevent -- as prevent it shall; there is no doubt about it -- any increase in the debenture debt whereby those who enjoy the privilege, should have the opportunity of paying for it.

But in the presentation of the debt of the province of Ontario, any reference which I made to an item called "Contingent Liabilities" does not give the true picture. These continued liabilities, according to the report presented by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) now amount to five hundred million dollars -- one half a billion dollars, practically as much as the total funded

debt of the province of Ontario, of five hundred and ninety-two million dollars. These contingent liabilities are just as real liabilities on the people of this province as any other form of debt. They are obligations which have to be paid and obviously the debt of this province must be paid by the people of this province, and it now amounts to over one billion dollars -- a staggering sum.

And the so-called "contingent liabilities" have increased over one hundred million dollars during this past year, all of it for Hydro conversion. The conversion proceedings are now much more than under way, and yet hundreds of millions of dollars will have been paid, or will have to be paid out by the good people of this province of Ontario, and a great many of them are saying, "and for what?".

The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was -- and rightly so -- praised the balance sheet of this Budget, not so much as a changing social liability, but on human values. In this I must concur. In the Budget Address, on page 28, we read:

> " A high standard of morality will accrue to the nation which sets for itself the goal of the human betterment of its people. The task of raising living standards and promoting general welfare is challenging and essential."

(PAGE D-10 FOLLOWS)

With that I am in complete accord, but I am afraid it will be difficult to reduce the tremendous cost of conversion of Hydro to human values, and a human betterment, but, unfortunately, the liability will exist until it is paid by the people of this province.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, while I do agree that the policy of applying surpluses against funded debt is a good one, it should be made abundantly clear -- as it was so well done by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) that apart from the actual statutory requirements for sinking funds in accordance with the terms of the bonds, at the time of the issue, it is merely a surplus invested by the government to retire the securities at their maturity.

I recommend for another year, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) distinguish between "sinking fund" requirements, and all that is necessary for this surplus, that is, profit from the surplusses. The government of this province is to be commended upon some features of its allocation for the coming year. Additional relief for hospitals will be much appreciated, and the large increase in the Budget for the Department of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) would indicate that it is desirable at all costs to maintain law and order, and I sincerely suggest that a good proportion of it be apportioned for the reduction of accidents and death on our public highways.

There are, in the Budget, figures for the Department of Municipal Affairs, and I do sincerely hope that it will be used in an endeavour to alleviate the problems which now rest on the shoulders of the taxpayers of these municipalities.

The same holds true for education, and the Department

of Welfare.

Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is nice to know that the province is financially able to do all of these things from its own limited sources of taxation, but the mere fact that these sources are limited, and, in addition, are vulnerable to drying up, such as was outlined by the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) in the presentation of his Budget.

(TAKE "E" FOLLOWS)

I think that all this should give us great cause for concern and should lead this government to further consideration of draining income wherever possible from the higher seat of government, from the federal government, itself.

This now brings me, Mr. Deputy Speaker, to a brief discussion of Dominion-Provincial relations. In so doing I would like to strike a cordial note for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I have read and re-read the proceedings of conferences which were held, one in Quebec and two in Ottawa, in the month of January, September and December of last year. I commend them for your reading.

As I read them I came to two very definite conclusions -- and I trust that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) will listen -- first, that the province of Ontario was well represented at these conferences in the person of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). After reading his speeches on those conferences I would not have been more proud of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) had he been a Liberal; secondly, my conclusion was that a new history of Canada is in the making, that the Fathers of Confederation of 1867 who builded better than they knew, are going to be honoured with the title of grandfathers of Confederation; that a new Canadian constitution is being formulated, one which will be framed by Canadians, one which will be domiciled in Canada, and a purely Canadian document. It is something which will take time. The Fathers of Confederation laboured many years before the eventful day of July 1, 1867. The problem today is more complex by far than it was in those days. In 1867 no one ever dreamed, for instance, that education would be a financial responsibility of anything but a municipality; social security was

unthinkable; and the invention of the automobile which has made it necessary for millions and millions of dollars to be spent on public highways was, even in the lifetime of many of us, considered to be an invention of the devil and would be driven off the road by public opinion. So we can go on . I am persuaded, having read the proceedings of these conferences that the spirit of harmony and co-operation which attended those meetings will result in a Canadian constitution, relieved of ties to the United Kingdom, with the full approval of the United Kingdom, with a devotion, loyalty and allegiance such as a grown up adult displays to his aged parent. It is in the light of these changing conditions that I approach this subject, that of Dominion-Provincial relations.

There must, of necessity, be a new pattern of financial obligations and relations, and progress which will administer adequately to the needs of the people of this province without undue hurt.to any one person or to any one group of persons; progress with respect to ole-age pensions at age 70 without a means test now is virtually accomplished. It would appear that satisfactory arrangements can be made to keep the provinces in this field with Federal government's support for those between 65 and 69 with indicated need. I am sure that every hon. member of this House is in favour of extending that support, that Federal support, to all groups of incapacitated persons, irrespective of age. Education would appear to be one of the great problems which is confronting the members who attend these conferences. I can see no reason why it should not. It would seem to me that the Federal government, for instance, could make grants towards teacher training, the

same as they do for help personnel, for school buildings the same as for hospitals and for teachers the same as for old-age pensions. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) stresses equity of opportunity. It would seem to me that if we do not wish to confine this equity within the boundaries of our own province but rather for the production of Canadian citizens such cannot be accomplished without Federal aid.

I was very pleased, indeed, to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) say the other day that he thought there would be some help in connection with our universities from the Federal government. This coincides entirely with my view. I placed a question on the Order Paper at the commencement of this Session asking the number of students who attended our Ontario Universities who come from outside of the province. The hon. members of this House will be interested to know that out of 32,000 students, 3500 of them -- those are approximate figures -- do come from outside the province; in other words, the province of Ontario is subsidizing these schools, something which should be done by the Dominion government. In spite of all that it seems to me that grants for elementary and secondary school purposes can be made without interfering in any way with the much cherished provincial autonomy about which we hint.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, we finally come to my pet "beef", with respect to the failure of the government to have joined the agreeing provinces years ago in the tax field. I am not going to refer to what has happened because of the failure of the government to participate in these fields, to what the hon. member for

Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) said in connection with social security. It looks as though, after many years, this is now receiving attention. As an introduction to what I am about to say in connection with the whole picture of Dominion-Provincial relations, I would like to quote two paragraphs from two of the very excellent addresses delivered by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). Referring to the first one, on January 12, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) said this.

> We from Ontario are prepared to discuss and consider any proposals which may be advanced by any of the governments here. We are prepared ourselves to advance proposals, not in a dogmatic way but as a basis only for discussion and consideration. We believe that if this conference decides that there should be a method of amending our constitution, then the representatives here can find the way. If the fathers of confederation could find a basis for union -- an immensely difficult problem indeed -- we in 1950, in the same spirit, can find a way to make amendments ourselves which will be satisfactory to all the governments and to all the interests in our country. The representatives here from Ontario are prepared to give their fullest co-operation, with the hope that an early and complete solution will be found."

Then the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), said at the

December conference:

> "We believe that ways and means of either assigning or sharing these fields of taxation can be devised which will be mutually satisfactory to the federal government as well as to the provinces. After all, such a recognition carries with it the realization that both federal and provincial taxes come from the same source, namely, the Canadian taxpayer.
>
> The big job of government, whether it be federal, provincial or municipal, is to provide the services the people want with the greatest amount of efficiency and at the lowest cost possible. Taking the long-term view, the answer is to be found in allocating all responsibilities, and all taxing powers to carry out those responsibilities, to the government best able to do the job.
>
> I recognize that that may be idealistic, but taking the long-term view, which probably we cannot consider here at this present time, it seems to me that that is the answer if we could look forward 25 or 35 years from where we sit here today."

I want to say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that in both these extracts from two excellent addresses which were delivered by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) I am in complete accord; but I cannot see how the hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Frost) could find a better way to co-operate with the Dominion Government and with the other provinces than to join with them in the rental of the tax field, particularly in a plan which is so advantageous to the people of this province.

In the address which the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) made, he referred again to personal income tax. Now, I am getting just a little bit tired of hearing about that reference to personal income tax because he knows full well that he has no intention whatsoever of imposint personal income tax. He knows that in spite of the fact that it will not cost the taxpayers one cent more to pay provincial taxes it would mean political suicide to any government which tried to impose it. incidentally, a telephone call to the Minister of Finance in Ottawa last year before undertaking to draft that voluminous income tax Act would have saved the law clerks, would have saved this House and would have saved everybody a lot of time, would have saved some expense and would have saved a great deal of embarrassment, because I am sure there was no chance in the world that that suggestion would ever have been met with favour by the Minister of Finance in Ottawa.

However, let us now refer to some figures for the five years under which the plan has been or will continue to be operated, from the year 1947 to the year 1952. 1948, that is, the year ended 1948, on the rental basis $75,212,000.00 Ontario collected $65,764,000.00. These figures are extracted from the Public Accounts from 1948 to 1951 and from the Hon. Provincial Treasurer's Estimates for 1952. The information with respect to the rental field is

obtained from the schedule which was presented to all of the hon. members who attended the conference in December last. 1949, the rental was $79,000,000.00, Ontario collected almost $80,000,000.00; in 1950 $88,000,000.00 compared with $82,000,000.00; $88,000,000.00 on the rental agreement, $82,000,000.00, they collected in taxes; in 1951, $97,000,000.00 compared with $90,000,000.00; and, on the basis of the Provincial Treasurer's own Estimates, on the basis of his own Department Estimates for the year which will end in 1952, he expects to collect $90,000,000.00. The figure which is on this schedule, prepared by the Deputy Minister of Finance for the year ending 1952 is $105,000,000.00, making a total under the rental basis of $444,500,000.00 compared with $408,000,000.00 which will be collected by the end of 1952 year on the basis of Ontario being in the field, itself. All of which indicates that the province of Ontario by March 31, 1952 will be short $36,000,000.00, money which she could have earned in her own right -- enough money to pay $10.00 additional on old-age pensions, enough money to establish cancer clinics throughout the entire province of Ontario at strategic points, enough money to defray the cost of hospitalization for indigent patients or, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) did not want to use it for that purpose it could be used to reduce the debenture debt of this province to the extent of $36,000,000.00. But, that is not the only feature; this government has, in the process of collecting this money, been biting the very hand which feeds it. It has been extracting from industry 7%, whereas the amount which would be levied by the Federal government is 5%.

It has extracted from industry a corporation tax which amount to close to $900,000.00 each year and a tax on capital which amount to close to $2,000,000.00 each year. In addition, the people of this province are saddled with an expenditure of close to half a million dollars each year for the administration of this task.

(TAKE "F" FOLLOWS)

All of this, not to mention any difficulties and expense to which the taxpayer is put in the preparation of his return. Provincial autonomy may have some backing but it is going to be awfully difficult to convince the people of the Province of Ontario, who are essentially citizens of the Dominion of Canada first, that it is worth the terrific price that is being paid.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by presenting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) for his consideration a summary of the recommendations which have been made in this address.

1. That the Audit Act be amended in line with the new Federal Public Finance Act.

2. That the hon. Ministers investigate the condition of departmental accounts with a view of keeping the accounts up to date.

3. That the item in the Liquor Control Board accounts designated as "Provision for revenue stabilization" be transferred to the Public Accounts forthwith.

4. That the duties of the Treasury Board be reduced from that of administration to one of policy and that special warrants be issued only by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario.

5. That the Highway Improvement Fund section of the Highway Traffic Act be repealed.

Now, I did not mention anything about that in my address because it was covered rather fully by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) but it serves no function whatsoever and should be repealed forthwith.

6. That the departmental detail contained in the Public Accounts relating to appropriations be corrected to

ignore internal revenue and that such revenue be considered as part of the gross revenue of the province.

7. That the preparation of Estimates be changed to include those for the previous year with differences noted.

8. That cost of living bonus be incorporated in salaries and that the government resolve to give effect thereto in the Estimates to be presented to this Legislature.

9. That a meeting of the Public Accounts Committee be called with the view of investigation into the procedure of certain departments and with the suggestion that such investigation may, over the next few years, cover all Departments.

10. That the Public Accounts include as an annual charge against revenue the statutory requirements for Sinking Fund purposes distinctly apart from Reserves appropriated for retirement of securities upon call or upon maturity.

11. That implementation of pensions, over and above those sponsored by the Federal Government for persons 70 years of age and over, now being considered by the Province of Ontario include all incapacitated persons irrespective of age, where need is shown.

12. That this government continue to cooperate to the fullest extent with the Fedderal Government and the other provinces with the view of expediting proposed plans for social security and if at all possible seek to enter the tax rental field as of April 1st, 1951, with the view of salvaging as much as possible of the loss in dollars incurred as a result of the province not being in the field from the start.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, it is not my intention to deal with the amendment which was presented by the hon. member for

Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) as that will be done by either the leader of this group in the House (Mr. Oliver) or by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon).

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to you and to the hon. members of the House for their very kind attention to this rather lengthy address and I do sincerely hope that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) will see fit to at least give consideration to these recommendations.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. A. A. MacLEOD (Bellwoods): Mr. Deputy Speaker, may I begin my remarks this afternoon by tendering my congratulations to the financial critic of the official opposition (Mr. Wismer) who is not in his seat at the moment, and to say that I feel he did a very excellent job, a very comprehensive analysis of the Budget speech of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). I must say, however, that I did feel that the financial critic of the official Opposition (Mr. Wismer) did not get a very good break, did not get as good a break as the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

MISS A. MacPHAIL (York East): Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: After all, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was able to take the stage promptly at two of the clock and held it for two hours and then took his departure and left us with very mundane matters. However, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) was shunted off on the siding for a couple of hours while we were subjected to the unusual procedure of having hon. Ministers make awfully lengthy speeches on the first reading of their Bills. Now, that is wrong, that is bad.

MR. G. EAMON PARK (Dovercourt): The Bills did not

live up to the pledges.

MR. MacLEOD: Do not try to heckle me because you are not in your proper place. I have got you today. I think that was rather unfortunate.

MISS MacPHAIL: It is bad parliamentary form.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, I do suggest, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the official financial critic in this House has a function equal and comparable to that of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Because he has an obligation and a responsibility to the citizens of this province and I do not think that the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) should have been given that disadvantage. Now, if the hon. member were here, there is a su estion I would like to make. Perhaps I will make it anyway in the hops and expectation he might read H ansard. I think we should establish in this House the practise at Ottawa where the official critic of the Opposition does not give the Finance Minister a clear field on Budget day or Budget night but jumps into the debate immediately following and takes a half an hour to deliver some jabs at the Budget speech.

MR. FROST: That is all right with me.

MR. MacLEOD: I do not blame you for it but I pass it on to the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) or, perhaps I should pass it on to you, because it is barely possible you may be over here on this side next year and you may be the one to take advantage of this proposal.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) on the excellence of his contribution today, a very well considered analysis of the

Budget and I am glad to see that my good friend the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) was in such good shape. As a matter of fact, I thought a couple of times he was really going to get angry. We welcome his presence in this House and we are all very glad despite what happened to him when the unhallowed hand of hon. C. D. Howe fell on his shoulders a few months ago, he still survived to perform in this House a very admirable role of sharing in the criticism of the government's fiscal policy.

Now, I come to my good friend, "The Laird of Lindsay" (Mr. Frost). A number of proposals have been made for his future. The hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) suggested he might go to the Red Chamber. It was suggested that Mr. St. Laurent could help the cause of Liberalism by putting the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in the Senate. Well, I do not think that is good enough for him.

MISS MacPHAIL : No, I do not think so either.

MR. MacLEOD: And so, I have a suggestion to make. I really do not think that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was meant to play the game of primitive politics.

MISS MacPHAIL: He does it well, though.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes, but he never can do justice himself and I do seriously suggest that a great deal of thought has been given to the idea of this country following the practise of other members of the Commonwealth in naming citizens of their own country to the post of Governor-General, that the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and Provincial Treasurer would be a most admirable person to be the first Canadian Governor-General of Canada.

SOME hon. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that his benign

and sometimes even beatific person moving about the country accompanied as he would be by one of the lovliest women in Canada, Mrs. Frost--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR MacLEOD: Would be a benediction to this great land of ours. Now, I think he is cut out for a role like that and not the role of mean, petty, partisan politics that his office compels him to play in this House from day to day and from week to week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I might say that this is really the ninth consecutive occasion on which I have spoken to the traditional motion of the hon. Provincial Treasurer and I regret to say that I must begin again, as I have begun so often in the past by drawing attention to the utter unreality of the hon. Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) method of presenting to this House what purports to be a summary of the financial state of the Province of Ontario. I repeat what I said last year, that all of the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) budget speeches since 1944 have in the main been characterized by, first, gross inaccuracies in Budget forecasts amounting to irresponsibility, and, second, what I would describe as financial legerdemain to meet the political expediencies of the moment.

Now, let us examine that a bit. Let us look at the record since 1948---I will be generous with you, I will not go back to 1944, I will begin with 1948. The hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) forecast surpluses since 1948 add up to $24,500,000 since 1948 while his actual surpluses have reached the astounding figure of $91,750,000. Now, that is awfully poor bookkeeping and one would think that when the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) stood up the other day that at last he would begin to show signs of self con-

sciousness, even something of guilt for perpetuating this hoax on this Assembly for the past four or five years, but he is totally unconscious of any sense of wrongdoing. As a matter of fact, when I listened to him the other day it reminded me of that famous statement attributed to Miss West, who said: "To err is human but it feels divine."

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MISS MacPHAIL : He makes it sound divine.

MR. MacLEOD: And yet, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) had he unmitigated gall to criticize my good friend the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) for some very minor inexactitude in a radio broadcast which he made some weeks ago. I might say I was rather amazed on Budget day when my good friend the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) referred to certain remarks made in this House by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) in which he expressed his doubt as to the ability of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to produce a surplus this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I do not share the view expressed by the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown), which suggests I know a little more about the capitalist system than he does. In fact, I was the only member in this House because I do not think the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) entered into this field, who last year forecast a surplus of $25,000,000 in contrast to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) who on Budget day boasted with his confident optimism and forecast a surplus of $74,000,000 when he presented that Budget a year ago. Well, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) was wrong by $15,750,000 while I missed by only a couple of million.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Next year the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) forecasts a surplus of seven and three-quarter million dollars and I observed that my good friend the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Hamilton) actually laughed out loud when that figure was given. Now, mark this on your linen cuff, I have no hesitation in predicting that in 1952 if the present hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) is still in that position that he will stand up over there and announce a real surplus of between $25,000,000 and $30,000,000.

MR. SALSBERG: And will claim credit for it.

MR. MacLEOD: And will claim credit for it. Now, mark it down and see what happens. Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been happening during the past seven years I am wondering if we should not insist upon an entirely new approach and new procedure in Budget preparation and presentation. The form in which the Budget has been coming to us since my good friend the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) took over--I do not know what it was like before that, it was probably worse--

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh,

MR. MacLEOD: But since he took over, it it obviously unsatisfactory ince it clearly fails to give a reliable picture of the financial standing of the Province of Ontario. Perhaps, therefore, we should insist that before Budgets are presented to this House in future they should first be approved by the Provincial Auditor who will certify as to the accuracy of the figures contained therein. Under such an arrangement, knowing Mr. Cotnam as we do, we could feel satisfied that we are dealing with a reliable financial statement and not with the propaganda of the party in power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I detected in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) performance on Budget day this year something rather different than on previous occasions. It was what one might call a lack-lustre performance and it left me with the impression that even the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has grown rather weary in his unsuccessful efforts to hoodwink "Old Man Ontario" and his sons and daughters. In the past, it was always possible for the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to generate some enthusiasm among his followers on that side of the House but this time they sat glum and dispirited throughout the whole performance. That was especially true over there in "atrophy row," the second row back.

(Take G follows)

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And it was quite clear that they had not received any coaching from the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Murdoch) because the hands went up like that, and like that, but nothing happened.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And I suggest that the reason for that is that my hon. friends opposite have ceased to believe their own propoganda.

MISS AGNES MACPHAIL (York East): Too bad.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, Mr. Speaker, there was one very curious omission in the Budget speech some days ago. The House will recall that last year my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) devoted considerable time to the 5 per cent of personal income tax which he has been entitled to collect since 1947. A year ago, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) led us to believe that some deal was then in prospect with Ottawa, in fact, we even passed enabling legislation to speed the Bill along. Now I say to my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) -- he cannot answer for more, but I am going to put the question to him anyway -- did something go wrong? Why does not my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) take this House into his confidence? Why not lay all your cards on the table and if you have got yourself into trouble, we shall of course be only too glad to help you out -- comma --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Comma -- if it will help the Province of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Speaker, I need hardly remind the

House that I have been pressing my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) since 1947 to collect that 5 per cent of personal income tax, but to no avail. When I used to sit over there for several years, I pleaded with him till I had tears in my eyes, but he would not. If the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) now has the effrontery to include part of this money which he has so wantonly thrown away, in a set of figures at page 46 of his Budget speech in which he endeavours to prove that Ontario is better off for having refused to sign a taxation agreement with Ottawa. And here I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) what he means when he says on page 8 of the Budget speech:

> "We hold a reserve of 5 per cent personal income tax which we can collect without raising the level of provincial taxes. This amounts to $55 million".

Now, does this mean that my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) is going to lay claim to the revenue for the period in which it was not collected? Is this a retroactive thought of his? And why does he place the figure at a mere $55 million? If we are to accept the estimate used by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost), last year, the total should be $67 billion, because I have a little memo that you sent us last year where you estimated that tax as being worth $17,500,000. I thought we were living in a period of inflation. The way it stands on page 46, it has suddenly shrunken down to a total of $55 million, whereas on the basis of last year's computation, it should be $67 million.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) informed us that the government is now giving serious consideration to a new set of tax proposals from the Federal government, which he says

are much more favourable to Ontario. On the other hand, the figures that he sets out on page 46 of the Budget address are clearly intended to negate that view.

Now, once again I want to make the position of this group very clear. I pointed out in the House a year ago that we have never at any time since 1945 regarded the battles that have been taking place between Queen's Park and Ottawa as a clash between two governmental theories of centralism and federalism, though we have always recognized that from time to time it served the interests of either Queen's Park or Ottawa to give the impression that this was the case. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in retrospect it is all too clear that what went on in 1945 and continued until the summer of 1949 was nothing more than an unprincipled struggle between two political groups to gain control of the federal government at Toronto and Ottawa.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACLEOD: And as I said last year, from 1945 to 1949 there was going on in this country a struggle for power, a cold war at the national level, in which the federal Liveral party finally won out, and the people of Canada lost out.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Put that in your pipe and smoke it.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): That is your own point of view.

MR. MacLEOD: That is my own point of view, and I want to make it abundantly clear that it is my point of view.

MR. OLIVER: You do?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): You made it.

MR. MacLEOD: But remember, Mr. Speaker, the reports that appeared in the press at the time that the Dominion-Provincial Conferences came to such an abrupt end in 1946, and the correspondents who were present informed us that the delegates to the conference sang "Oh Canada" -- off key.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And no wonder, Mr. Speaker, because Canada and the people of Canada were farthest from the thoughts of the people who sat around that table. They were thinking about the political fortunes of their respective parties that is all. Those were in the days when all were for the party and none were for the state.

MISS MACPHAIL: Yes, and none were for the state.

MR. MacLEOD: And no one knows that better than my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost). Now, in 1945 when the federal government took over its three-fold integrated plan for centralization of the taxing power, providing a measure of social security together with a public investment program to cushion the economic slump, our position was then that Ontario should have accepted the Dominion proposals in principle, seeking of course the best deal possible for the province of Ontario. When the 1946 conference -- the conference that began in 1945 and ended in 1946 -- was torpedoed by the Emperor of Ontario and his Crown Prince, the Laird of Lindsay, --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: -- we over here then urged acceptance of the modified taxation proposal. We argued that if that were done, it would remove the chief excuse that Ottawa had

for not proceeding with its social security program and its public investment plan. We argued that acceptance of the modified proposal would have produced as good a revenue position for Ontario as has ensued from this government's "lone-wolf" stand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize all too well, that this is past history or, as my hon. friend the Attorney General (Mr. Porter) would say if he were in his seat "Chestnuts". Well, all I can in reply to such a remark if he were here to make it would be: "Yes, chestnuts, and chestnuts coming home to roast".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Now at long last the hon. Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Frost) is beginning to regret the prodigal course he followed in the fabulous forties. I was very much struck by the fact that on Budget day for the first time in my memory at any rate, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) referred to "our vulnerable position". He never talked about "vulnerability" before, it was always "buoyancy," "bursting at the seams". Now he is beginning to get a little afraid of what lies just ahead.

The Modern Liberal Democrats at Ottawa have long since consigned that social security program of 1945 to the ashcan. Indeed, the very term "social security" has become almost subversive in this country. Listen to the great social security-ite of 1945, the hon. Brooke Claxton:

> "Advocating lower taxes and at the same time increased old age pensions and health insurance [illegible] the Communist game because it creates appetites that

cannot be met".

Well, the Tories were not thinking about that in 1949, that is what they were proposing -- lower taxes, more social security, old age pensions, no means test. You remember that. I have no doubt that you made some of the speeches.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, Mr. Speaker, the question is, what is to be done now? That is water under the briedge; what is to be done now, where do we go from here? In our view the scrapping of the social security program -- for we believe it has been scrapped -- precludes any likelihood of early agreement on old age pensions without a means test. With the social security program scrapped -- and I see my hon. friend the member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) is not here, but I commission the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) to pass this on -- with the social security program of 1945 scrapped, I see no urgency for a taxation agreement with Ottawa, divorced from the social security program. On the contrary, unless Ottawa revised the 1945 social security program and revises it upwards, I think that we should proceed in the province of Ontario to introduce a social security program of our own.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Several other provinces -- British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan -- have made a start in that direction. This is not a new suggestion from this corner of the House, or this little island.

MR. SALSBERG: This important little island.

MR. MacLEOD: This embattled little island.

MR. SALSBERG: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Speaking on the Budget in 1948 I said:

"Since the government of Ontario has refused the Dominion offer which included important social security benefits for the majority of Ontario's people, it is the responsibility of the provincial government to undertake these needed measures itself. They include health insurance, expanded public health services and increased old age pensions".

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say let Ontario raise the old age pension $50. for the 90,000 senior citizens who are now drawing the miserable $40. a month.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: British Columbia has done it, why cannot we? We have the money to do that now, and my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) wants to leave that 21 million dollars in the sinking fund. He can still give that extra $10 monthly to the old-age pensioners of this province by adding a mere 1 per cent to the Corporation Profits Tax. In other words, a 1 per cent increase in Corporation Profits Tax will give him the amount required to hand everyone of the 90 thousand old-age pensioners in the province of Ontario an extra $10 a month.

Now, we of course have been advocating for a long time that this tax be increased to 10 per cent. That would make it worth, on the basis of this year's figure, $30 million. My hon. friend the member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) suggested nine. Well, if he got that far, maybe we could compromise and make it ten, so that there would be agreement.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Nine and a half.

MR. MacLEOD: The Modern Liberal Democrats would agree to that, too, and it would be almost unanimous without you.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: In this connection, Mr. Speaker, surely my hon. friend the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) has not forgotten the stirring words of his former chief and predecessor, spoken over the Ontario air waves on August, 1944. I am sure the hon. member fro Brant (Mr. Nixon) remembers that.

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): We all remember that.

MR. MacLEOD: Because that was the end of the truce that had existed. That finished the truce. On that occasion Colonel Drew acknowledged that the first duty of the province of Ontario was to provide social security for its own people. If you doubt that, listen to his words:

> "When we can handle social services much better and at a fraction of the cost, it is our duty to insist that we be permitted to do so and we will fulfil that duty."

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Hurray.

MR. MacLEOD: Now, it will be remembered of course that those words were used by Colonel Drew when he was attempting to block the family allowances. You remember that? Now the role is in reverse. It is Ottawa that refused to act in the field of social security, and Ontario seems to be quite satisfied. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes get the impression that Queen's Park and Ottawa

have signed a mutual back-scratching pact in the last year or so.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: Hardly a day goes by now but the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Frost) gets up to quote with approbation and approval something that the hon. Mr. Abbott has said.

MR. OLIVER: He could do worse than that.

MR. MacLEOD: And on another occasion Mr. Abbott says: "Well, Ontario decided to go in alone, but thank heaven they didn't do anything to make it more difficult for us".

So there was just a little division of responsibility there, neither one of them had the slightest intention of doing anything for the people of this country in 1945, although they went through the motions, they argued and flung epithets back and forth. Today they are scratching each other's backs, and they have agreed to agree to do nothing for the people of this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Now we believe, Mr. Speaker, that Ontario can best advance the cause of national social security at this stage by the power of example. A $50. a month pension in Ontario, in addition to helping our own senior citiznes, is bound to have a powerful effect in Quebec and in the other provinces. If we do it here, these provinces will be disposed to emulate our example. So, too, would an Ontario health plan and a general stepping up of all social services in this province.

Mr. Speaker, some months ago a very distinguished citizen of this province -- and I would ask my hon. friend the member for Grey to listen to this if he does not mind --

MR. OLIVER: Yes, I will. I will give it every attention.

MR. MacLEOD: A very distinguished citizen of this province a month or so ago madea very important statement. I think this gentleman is a resident of Owen Sound. He made a very moving appeal on behalf of the senior citizens of the province of Ontario -- I want to be sure that he is listening. I quote from the Toronto Daily Star the following:

"$40. a month, a sin and a shame -- "

MISS MACPHAIL: He was right.

MR. MacLEOD: "-- for old age pensioners. Should be $75"

Now, who do you suppose is the author of that strong statement? Well, the name is Phillips, Dr. Mackinnon Phillips. I was rather hoping that my good friend (Dr. Phillips) would have repeated those words when he made that very excellent address during the Throne debate.

Now, is $40. a month for an old age pensioner in the province of Ontario a sin and a shame?

MISS MACPHAIL: It is.

MR. SALSBERG: It is.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, there seems to be general agreement over here on this side of the House, but let the Toronto Welfare Council -- which is not a partisan organization, not a political organization -- give the answer. And mark you, Mr. Speaker, the figures I am about to quote are well over a year old.

The Welfare Council, a most reputable body, made a study on what it cost a senior citizen of this province, over 70 years of age, living alone, as tens of thousands of them do, in our urban centres, in a city rooming house. Just listen to this monthly budget, which is considered the minimum for health and self-respect.

First, for food, $23.17 a month

For clothing and personal upkeep, $5.23 a month

For personal case (shaving, etc.) .83 a month

Transportation .50 a month.

Reading material .25 a month.

Now, what would happen if one of those old age pensioners decided that he wanted to read the Ontario Hansard on a given day? Why, even that would cost him $7.00 a copy at current rates.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MacLEOD: And he would not be able to read anything again -- perhaps he would not be able to read anything. All depending on whose speech he read.

(TAKE "H" FOLLOWS)

"Recreation, 25 cents a week, $1.08 per month".

"Religion, 25 cents a week ,-

MR. J.W. HANNA (Huron-Bruce): How much is allowed for beer?

MR. MACLEOD: "Religion, 25 cents a week, $1.08 a month". What kind of religion can you get for $1.08 per month?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: Someone once asked how a man could live a christian life on $25.00 a month, and the answer was: "What other kind of a life can he live"?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: 25 cents a week. As I said last year, you cannot even get by in Free Church of Scotland, on that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: Personal allowance (smoking) $2.17 per month.

Laundry, $1.00 per month.

Health supplies, iodine, and so forth, 10 cents a month.

Newspapers and radio, 96 cents per month.

Family entertainment -- when the old gentleman decides to invite his sisters and cousins and aunts and bring them together, 69 cents a month for family entertainment.

And then finally, room rent at $5.00 a week, or $21.50 a month, all of which adds up to a total of $58.56.

Now, it should be noted that there is no provision for health and medical services and other essentials, but

the cost of that frugal budget -- more than a year ago -- was $58.56, or $18.56 more than the senior citizen was then receiving. What must it be like now that the cost of living index has risen 7 or 8 or 9 points?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself to my hon. friend, the Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost).

Mr. Speaker, does it help these people who have given the best years of their lives to Canada, who have helped to fashion what my friend, the Treasurer, calls "our Canadian way of life"; does it help them in their dire distress to be told that when Ottawa and the other provinces agree, Ontario stands prepared to pay 25% of any basic pension agreed upon. The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) told us on Tuesday that we must protect the credit of the province. But is there not such a thing as moral credit? Is this government prepared to sacrifice the health and welfare of its senior citizens on the altar of a banking house. I say it is the clear, inescapable duty of this government to take care of its aged citizens now. Surely my friend has not forgotten what he said in his budget speech of 1946, -- "Let us think not merely in terms of money values, not columns of figures and statistics but in terms of human values."

Mr. Speaker, some days ago in this House we listened to a most arresting speech by the new hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) -- a most estimable gentleman with a lot of common sense -- I want to compliment my good friend on his elevation to that important post and at the same time compliment the government of availing itself of his able services.

That is met with complete silence.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MACLEOD: You had better take the boys back into the room and rehearse them again.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: We are very modest over here.

MR. MACLEOD: The Minister devoted a great part of his speech to a subject that has been very close to my heart and to which I have devoted much of the time of this House since 1946. Let me summarize quickly some of the startling facts mentioned by the Minister:

1. There are now 19,000 patients in Ontario's Mental hospitals; 2,200 waiting for admission, with another 2,200 in rehabilitation homes.
2. The average number of patients in mental hospitals exceed the combined number of patients in all public hospitals, homes for incurables, and convalescent hospitals in the province.
3. Four out of every 1,000 persons in the population are inmates of mental hospitals.
4. 26% of the permanent civil service make up the staffs of these institutions.
5. An average of 4,000 patients are annually admitted to mental hospitals in Ontario; 3,000 are new patients and 1,000 return for treatment.
6. Public expenditures on mental disease increased from 5 million dollars in 1940 to approximately 15 million in 1950.
7. Close to 60% of the 19,000 patients in mental hospitals are youthful persons, most of them

could be cured if given modern treatment in time.

8. Out of 3,000 patients placed out on probation in the community in 1940, almost 2,000 returned to hospitals for indefinite care owing to lack of rehabilitation services. Of 543 patients who were recently placed in boarding homes, 340 returned to the hospital.

Some of these figures are not new. I have brought them to the attention of the House on many occasions in past years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) himself is deeply concerned with this great social problem - perhaps the most serious social problem of our time -- and I have confidence that he, personally, will give it close attention. But I cannot forget that seven years ago the hon. Minister's predecessor, Dr. Vivian, also showed great concern and, indeed, promised vigorous action. My good friend, the hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) says that the province needs more trained staff for hospitals and clinics, more facilities for preventive work, a well organized and adequate rehabilitation program and that an extensive program for psychiatric research is needed.

But, Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne in 1944 had this to say on the same subject:

> " At present 14,172 occupy accommodation originally planned for 11,000 persons. It is the general experience on this continent that five beds per 1,000 of the population is required in the treatment

of these groups (of the mentally ill). On this basis, Ontario requires 19,000 beds. It is hoped to remedy this situation as rapidly as materials can be made available for the purpose. Owing to the extent of the problem the government has decided two other approaches should be made, namely research and prevention. With this in mind the division of psychiatric research has been organized with a well-known British research physician in charge. In the field of prevention it is proposed to extend the mental health clinics to serve all parts of the province as soon as the 57 physicians now on loan for special work in the armed forces again become available."

Well, Mr. Speaker, those of us who were in the House in 1944 found those words rather reassuring. But now after seven long years we are confronted with the melancholy report given us only a few days ago by the new Minister and the startling figures which appeared in Votes and proceedings of March 2nd, showing that bed capacity in our hospitals has increased from 3.80 in 1945 to 3.83 in 1950 - in seven years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, according to the estimates of 1943 - and bearing in mind that mental illness has been increasing faster than the population - we should have at least 22,500 beds. The number of patients since 1944 has increased by almost 5,000 but as nearly as I can estimate it we have added less than 1,000 new beds.

Now according to the standards laid down by the American Association of Psychiatrists, our Ontario mental hospitals are also seriouly understaffed and we

are spending far too little on the care of these patients. In short, if bed capacity were brought into line with requirements we should now be spending on these institutions an amount not far short of the total expenditures of our Health Department.

In my view we require something more than more hospitals, more psychiatrists and better facilities for tr treatment. These things are necessary, of course, but we could have all of them and still not be making any progress towards reducing that startling figure of 4,000 new cases a year. I am sure that the Hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) will agree with me that we must somehow find ways and means of getting at the source of mental illness. Why is it that we have three to four thousand new cases a year?

I am quite convinced myself that there is a close connection between these alarming figures and the sorded housing conditions in many of our cities and towns. Surely there is some connection between the increase in mental illness and the widespread fear of insecurity as old age approaches. And what do you suppose are the effects of young children being forced to shift for themselves because their mothers are compelled to go out to work to augment the family income? And, finally, what about the effects on the minds of our young people, and elders, too, of the social sewage we import from the United States in the form of low grade movies, salacious books and crime comics?

My friend, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) says we are now spending 15 million dollars on mental health compared with 5 million spent in 1943.

It would be much more accurate to say that we are spending 15 million dollars on mental illness because we refuse to spend money on mental health. We are subsidizing at the wrong en as I indicated a moment ago it is seven years aince a Progressive Conservative government, of which the present hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) was 2 I/c, promised an expanded program of psychiatric research. We were informed that a division of psychiatric research had been organized with a well-known British Research physician in charge. There was to be an extension of Mental Health Clinics. Now, after seven years the Minister tells us there are four such clinics in the province. Surely we should have at least 50 by this time. The hon. Minister (Mr. Phillips) admits that many of those in our mental hospitals are there because clinical treatments were not available in the early stages of their illness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I inquired last year about the "Special Division" and the "well known British Research Director", I was given to understand that neither existed. Indeed, I need hardly have a sked the question since the facts were all too clear in the Health Department estimates then before us. I think the hon. members of this House will be interested in these figures comparing the amount we spend on mental illness with what we spend on getting at its causes: In ten years we have spent, or will spend - I am including this year - a total of $91 million on maintenance of mental institutions, while during the same period the amount spend on psychiatric research was a paltry $35,544.00. There has

been no estimate before us for psychiatric research since 1949, and there is no provision for that service in the 1951-52 estimates now before us. Hence, while we want to be fair and just to the new Minister, he can hardly object if we remind him that in the past there has been a wide gap between promise and performance and that the estimates he has placed before the House for his department fall far short of the program he outlined to us earlier in the session.

Now, I want to say a few words about the serious shortage of staff in our mental institutions. In a recent address Dr. George S. Stevenson, Medical Director of the American Mental Health Association, pointed out that in British Mental Hospitals there is one psychiatrist for every 85 patients.

(TAKE "I" FOLLOWS)

Do you get that? One for every [illegible] patients; in Germany, 1 psychiatrist for every 150 patients, in the United States one psychiatrist for every 200 patients, and in this great enlightened province of Ontario with its boastful Tory government, we have 1 psychiatrist for every 1,225 patients.

MR. HANNA: The best country in the world.

MR. MacLEOD: Those are the figures of the government. They were given in answer to a question of mine a year ago. At that time the same answer made it clear that there is a very serious shortage of doctors, nurses, occupational therapists, properly trained attendants, and other personnel in our mental institutions. There can be no doubt, I think, that much of this shortage is due to the unwillingness of this government to permit its Department of Health to pay the kind of salary necessary to attract the type of people required for this work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: According to the American Psychiatric Association we should be spending at least $5. a day per patient for good, care and treatment. I was informed last year that the 1949-1950 average per patient in Ontario mental hospitals was $2.06 which is less than half the required minimum. On the other hand, Dr. Norman L. Easton of the Ontario Hospital, New Toronto, speaking at a meeting in this city on November 20, last, stated that we were [illegible] only a dollar per day per patient, in the mental institutions of this province.

One final and very important point. Dr. Stevenson, to whom I referred a moment ago. In his view an adequate mental health service would require a minimum of 1 psychiatrist for each 20,000 of our population. I would like the

hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) to listen to this. Dr. Stevenson stated that we require a minimum of 1 psychiatrist for every 20,000 of our population. In other words, we need at least 225 psychiatrists in the province of Ontario. Actually we have 112, of whom 50 serve in mental institutions. What are the prospects of filling that gap in the foreseeable future? It should be borne in mind, and this was stated in Votes and Proceedings last year -- that in order to be a psychiatrist in the province of Ontario one must first of all be a graduate of an approved medical school. How many years of that?

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, that is six years.

MR. MacLEOD: One must have a general interneship for one year, which is seven years; one must have four years of post-graduate training, which is eleven years. How many of the men or how many of the women who are called upon to meet such a high standard would be willing to serve at the present salary levels in the province of Ontario? I ask this question, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips). Does not that explain why a year ago there were only 19 students in psychiatry in all Ontario universities? What do you suppose the farmers of Ontario would think if there were only 19 students registered in the Veterinary College at Guelph this year?

MR. SALSBERG: And, of the 19, some will go to the United States, to be paid more.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes; some will go to the United States.

Do you know why you do not have psychiatrists? I will tell you why; because you are not paying them enough.

I picked up the schedule which the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) clipped on Hansard the other day. It is very revealing. We pay provincial statisticians -- presumably those are the people who help the provincial treasurer (Mr. Frost) who gives us the Budgets -- the provincial statisticians; I mean that is part of their duties at any rate. Presumably they are people who gave us that conspectus a few years ago which everybody in the government repudiated. They start at $5,500. to $6,000. and they go up. I am not suggesting that they are overpaid. I think, with all the figures they have to add up, maybe they should have a raise in pay. But, what about the psychiatrists? I may say that psychiatrist, as such, are not mentioned in that schedule. I am assuming that psychiatrists and psychologists are interchangeable. Is that correct? According to the schedule put on Hansard the other day psychiatrists in the province of Ontario are not getting anything. However, psychologists are rather important people -- at least, they think they are, anyway. You have them in the Department of Reform Institutions and some in mental hospitals. The psychiatrists class start at $1,840. Actually, these people are in about the same category as a constable in the Provincial Police Force, with respect to the starting level, yet they are people who have to have high academic qualifications in order to do this work.

I will simply leave it at this, that if the present qualifications stand and if the present salaries paid remain, then the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) will have a bronze bust in the hall of fame in this building before

we have enough psychiatrists to staff the mental hospitals in this province. I must point out, again, that a number of these so-called mental hospitals are not mental hospitals, they are custodial institutions. They are not worthy to be called by the name of mental hospitals. They are places of detention, or, as Dr. J. D. Griffiths of the National Mental Health Committee has said, most of these institutions are archaic and it is a waste of money to keep on building additions to them. First and foremost in that category, of course, is the miserable, century-old dungeon at 999 Queen St. in this city, built in 1845. It is to the everlasting shame -- I want this to sink in on the other side of the House and here -- of this and preceding governments that human beings, almost 1,300 of them, should be herded into an institution which was condemned by a Royal Commission 20 years ago, and built for 750 patients, as was the hospital in the home town of my learned friend, built in 1869. I say that the Modern Liberal Democracy and the monetary hypocrisy has to share the blame and the responsibility for the existence of that scandalous, shocking institution. I say that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) would certainly earn a place for himself among great human beings if he would make it his first responsibility to close that place down. It is not fit for human beings at all. I was in there several years ago. I have not gotten over it yet, the odour in the place, these patients who do not even have hospital clothing, have been there for years with no facilities even for dry-cleaning their clothing, and to get that heavy, sour smell, which comes from sitting in a corridor where there is no proper ventialation where they sit all day long on wooden benches

with nothing to do. I repeat it is nothing short of a disgrace to this province and to this nation that 999 Queen St. is permitted to operate. It does not even meet the requirements of a modern prison, to say anything of a mental hospital. In the light of these conditions, why is it that Ontario is not taking full advantage of the federal grants for mental health? It is rather shocking to find that of $4,377,489 made available to Ontario during 1950-1951, only $1,760,916. was accepted. What possible reason can be advanced for refusing these grants when mental experts tell us that of 78,000 children in the schools of Toronto between the ages of 5 and 17 years, 3 to 4 thousand will go to hospitals with a serious mental illness and that 1 or 2 thousand of them will go to jail? Once more, I urge the government to tackle this whole problem of mental health in a bold fashion and let the emphasis be on mental health and on the prevention of mental illness. I again urge the government to appoint a Royal Commission to look carefully into this great problem. That is the very best way to achieve that community-wide concern with the problem of which the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) spoke and which I, myself, and others have repeatedly urged. I am confident that a competent Commission, given at least a year to study the problem in all its aspects, and receiving, as I am sure it would, the full co-operation of our churches, social agencies, labour bodies and others, would finally be able to recommend a comprehensive program which would arrest and ultimately eliminate this serious threat to our province and nation.

Mr. Speaker, I realize this government and its immediate predecessor have been critized for appointing too many

Royal Commissions. I want to say very sincerely that I do not share that view. I think there is a great deal to be said for Royal Commissions. I suggest that some of the Royal Commissions which have been appointed in this province during the past 6 or 7 years have brought the affairs and problems of government and the problems of society, much closer to the people of Ontario than they are brought by the inadequate press coverage of what is said in this Legislature. That is not a criticism of the excellent people who serve in the press gallery, because I think they do perhaps more than justice to us, but it does not always get in the paper. I attended the Royal Commission on compensation, the Roach Commission, as did the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) and other hon. members here. I said to somebody,"Well, there is democracy working; there is an able public servant, like the hon. Mr. Justice Roach, sitting in the committee room downstairs with labour bodies and social agencies and all kinds of organizations, with them coming and making their representations, in public." That is better than the method of having the delegations go with the select few into the executive council chamber. You do not hear much about what happens in there. These Royal Commissions also open up these great issues and get people discussing them, and stimulate organizations to make representations, so on and so forth. I say to the government, do not be afriad of appointing another Royal Commission. If you appoint a Royal Commission on the conservation of human resources and give this problem to the people of Ontario, the great organizations in this province, you will be surprised by the common sense of many of the representatives you will meet in the team.

The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) said: "Well, we are going to involve everybody, the lawyers, the doctors --" and so on and so forth. How is he going to do that? The hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) is already an overworked man. He is a hard-working man. He has nine or ten, or more divisions of his Department to which to attend. I say he needs some help on this. I think that the establishment of the type of Commission I suggest would help the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Phillips) and would, above all, help to make the people of the province of Ontario conscious of one of the most serious social problems of our time.

Now, this is the end --

hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, that is the first contribution that you have made since 1944. You are doing very well. I am glad that your first effort was to say, "Hear, hear" to something I said.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) that the biggest disappointment in his speech for me, at any rate, was his failure to deal even inadequately with those great fundamental questions, which relate to the future of the province of Ontario.

Last year in the course of the Throne debate I and others, like the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) devoted a considerable portion of my remarks to the regulations policy of this government in dealing with the natural resources of the province of Ontario. I spoke particularly of the alienation of our iron ore deposits to American interests. It will be recalled that I moved an amendment to the address censuring the government for its failure to

protect these precious assets of Old Man Ontario. Only last week we voted on a somewhat similar motion of censure offered by the Official Opposition.

We are being told constantly that 85 per cent of our forest lands of this province are controlled by the people. That may be correct technically. The fact is, however, as the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) reminded us the other day, over 23 million acres of the finest timber lands of this province were in the group of a handful of companies, mostly American, who were reaping a tremendous harvest from the green gold of Ontario.

I do not want to burden the House with detailed figures, but it may interest the hon. members to know, and I want to say to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) that what I am about to say now did not come from a source which comes to my desk and the desks of other hon. members of this House, as was suggested by a nasty crack he made yesterday. It may interest the hon. members to know that the profits of the pulp and paper industry have increased over a thousand per cent in the past 10 years. Twelve pulp and paper companies operating in Ontario have piled up profits of over $200 million in excess of taxes during the past 5 years. That is not bad -- is it?

In the case of one of these companies, Kimberley-Clarke, profits before taxes per employee in 1949 alone amounted to $5,860.; that is to say, they made a profit before taxes of $5,860. out of each one of their employees. The hon. member for Fort Williams (Mr. Cox) was telling us the other day that three and one-half million cords of pulp wood have been exported to the United States in the

past eight years, double that of any comparable period and, as he said, sufficient to supply a paper mill and capable of giving employment to 1,000 for 75 years. Add to that, and we do not have the figures on this yet but I hope they are coming up -- the vast quantities of wood pulp shipped to American mills -- providing three jobs in Wisconsin and other states for every job provided in Ontario -- and you see full extent of the economic lunacy which this government calls a forest policy.

I should like to place on Hansard a set of figures indicating the exports of pulp wood from this province since the year 1928, giving not only cordage but also the dollar value. We find that from 1948 to 1950 we have shipped pulp wood to the United States to the tune of nearly $130 million. I placed those figures on Hansard.

(Page I-10 Follows)

PULPWOOD EXPORTED FROM ONTARIO

YEAR	CROWN LANDS	OTHER LANDS	TOTAL CORDS	VALUE
1928	840	611,984	612,824	$ 5,716,153.00
1929	4,872	423,579	428,451	4,034,437.00
1930	191	496,343	496,534	4,641,819.00
1931	860	402,5877	403,447	3,561,616.00
1932	35,407	109,362	144,769	1,197,304.00
1933	26,240	190,566	216,806	1,447,288.00
1934	84,042	196,115	280,157	2,120,624.00
1935	45,413	220,741	266,154	1,982,088.00
1936	118,633	221,698	340,331	2,671,863.00
1937	242,372	270,225	512,597	3,971,760.00
1938	324,844	288,212	613,056	5,009,527.00
1939	258,653	175,444	434,097	3,516,942.00
1940	360,286	169,478	529,764	4,741,618.00
1941	404,328	229,970	634,298	5,708,682.00
1942	482,598	254,450	737,048	7,910.179.00
1943	408,504	174,491	582,995	6,847.412.00
1944	250,221	134,358	384,579	4,699,848.00
1945	395,441	153,914	549,355	7,280,883.00
1946	579,407	178,070	757,477	11,446,819.00
1947	623,256	147,987	771,243	12,833,654.00
1948	470,693	199,978	670,671	11,898,334.00
1949	394,522	157,029	551,551	9,116,985.00
1950	305,690	129,946	435,636	7,616,083.00
	5,817,313	5,536,527	11,353,840	$ 129,971,918.00

The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) told us the other day that last year alone this country of ours brought back wood products from the United States to the tune of $100 million. In one year alone we brought back $100 million worth of wood products after shipping such inordinate amounts of pulp wood to the United States in the last 20 years or so.

(TAKE "J" FOLLOWS)

Now, ten years ago when some of the hon. Members on the treasury benches were sitting on this side of the house they were singing a very different tune. Only a few days ago I was looking through the journals and I came across a powerful resolution moved by the hon. Member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Challies), demanding what? Demanding the establishment of a Forest Reserve Commission similar to Hydro. Now, why has not the government implemented that resolution in the past seven years? They did put legislation on the statutes books which received unanamous approval, why have they not implemented the terms of that resolution? Why is this government now so reluctant to even discuss the Forest policy? That is not what we got from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott), a discussion of Forest policy comparable to the remarks made in this house by the hon. Member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) and the hon. Member for Fort William (Mr. Cox) and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) and others. We discussed Forest policy. Why has the government repudiated the policy advocated by the Progressive Conservative party in 1933? Apparently the present government is quite satisfied to preside over the liquidation of Ontario's forest empire and to sit idly by while the rich red gold of Steep Rock is carried away to fill the coffers of a Cleveland banker. I would commend to this government for serious consideration the following words by Lt. Col. G.R. Stevens, O.B.E., taken from a recent address by him to the Canadian Exporters Association.

Would the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) mind listening to this?

MR. FROST: I listen to every word you say.

MR. MACLEOD: I would like to have you listen to these words from the lips of Lt. Col. G.R. Stevens, O.B.E. The letters before and after his name surely make it clear that he does not belong to the Labor Progressive party. I mean he is a "solid" citizen, but what he says, what I am about to place on the record of this house indicates he is a very great Canadian. Colonel Stevens begins by pointing out that we are "disposing of our expendable natural wealth for the lowest possible return," and that unless this process is arrested we can look forward to "the realization of no higher future than that of a satellite, or economic colony of the United States."

Then Col. Stevens says "

> "The amount of Labor, Capital and brains expended on any article is the measure of its value. A country which exports its raw materials does the donkey work and is rewarded accordingly. The country which imports raw materials and processes them does the brain work and is rewarded accordingly. The potential loss in the export of raw materials is all the more regrettable when - as in the case of Canada - such export consists

in large part of expendable and irreplaceable resources such as our mines and timber. When we sell abroad that we could process at home we are accepting a dime for something which we - or our sons - should sell for a dollar. Nor is the loss only in terms of exhausted resources - empty mines and razed forests. The lost 90 cents, when measured in terms of additional population, in terms of political security, amounts to little less than a national catastrophe. It represents to Canada the difference between a state of economic satrapy and economic independence. It may be said that our natural resources are so vast that there is plenty for ourselves and the United States. This may be true in this generation, but have we no responsibility for the future? Must we bequeath to our sons and grandsons in the next generation a ravished landscrape, stripped of its forests and pitted like the moon with empty holes? I submit this to be a consideration we cannot evade".

I would ask the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to pay particular attention to the Colonel's closing words:

"One hundred years ago some of our American neighbors were bent on grabbing the rest of this Continent. They had a political party

and a slogan. That slogan was 'Manifest Destiny'. In full it meant that the manifest destiny of Canada was to be a part of the United States. It is a little startling to find this discarded theory being revised and this time in the minds of some Canadians who should know better. It is now called the Continentalist theory - whether it will come to pass I cannot say. If Canada declines to a continental satellite it will be because we have sold our heritage and because we have become content with a lesser destiny."

Mr. Speaker, surely the government of Ontario has a clear responsibility to play its full part in influencing the course of Canada's destiny. The rich natural resources of the province are in its keeping, and it is the government's duty to develop this wealth making potential for the benefit of the Canadian people, and not yield it to others.

And now, in closing, I want to place before the House a ten point program of action for the welfare of our province and its people:

This is by way of summary of what I have said,

1. I propose a ten dollar monthly supplement for all present old age pensioners in the province, now, not after you get all the provinces to agree, that is too far off.

MISS MACPHAIL: They will all be dead.

MR. MACLEOD: 2. We call upon the government

to increase Corporation Profits tax to ten per cent and repeal the Amusement Tax which constitutes an act of robbery, unnecessary robbery because what you are getting from Ottawa, what is available to you from Ottawa in the form of health grants is adequate to meet the health program you now have and probably a great deal more you do not need. But you take six million dollars from the simple pleasures of the poor.

3. I would urge again that this government assume responsibility in concert with the Federal Government if necessary to construct 25,000 low rental subsidized homes a year for the next five years. I want to say this to the government that you are now spending on law enforcement, on curative health measures, on reform institutions, about fifty-six million dollars a year. I suggest that many millions of these dollars could be saved for the people of this province if we give the people decent homes to live in.

4. I urge the government to appoint a rural commission on the conservation of human resources to cover the field of mental health, care for the aged, juvenile delinquency, alcoholism, etc.

5. I call on the government to establish an Ontario Forest Resources Commission, clothed with powers to (a) Review, and where necessary in the public interest, revise all existing contracts; (b) Require all companies to process a substantial volume of pulp products in Ontario mills; (c) Impose an export tax on all unfinished products; (d) Undertake a ten year Forest Rehabilitation program with an expenditure of $10 million annually;

(e) Enforce all purpose logging and manufacturing, instead of single purpose operation now being practised.

6. I call on the government to take immediate action to protect our Iron Ore deposits from alienation to external interests, and vigorous leadership by the Department of Planning and Development in an effort to establish a steel industry at the Head of the Lakes, as the Labour Delegation proposed yesterday.

7. Increased assistance to agriculture through a two million dollar annual grant for the next five years, to finance a program of Research Education, Extension and Marketing. Active intervention by the provincial government to develop new markets for Ontario farm products.

8. I call on the government to double the present grants for the establishment of community centres throughout the province. If you can give the young people of this province facilities to engage in creative, helpful recreation you will have fewer of them in reform institutions.

9. I think the government should increase by 50% the Mother's Allowance and Day Nurseries, and give substantial provincial aid for Day Care Centres.

10. I suggest, and here I am echoing what the Labour Delegation proposed yesterday, a five cent subsidy on milk and free milk for all Ontario school children.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be said, of course, that these things will cost money. That I admit. But let me remind the House again that "cost is the father and compensation the mother of progress".

Speaking in this House seven years ago my friend the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Frost) said:

"For the fine old province of Ontario there will be a great future. There will be a place fit for heroes to live in. We are building, not only for these times. We are planning a greater population; for industrial expansion; for prosperous farms and for happy and healthy people. We are laying the sure foundations for a greater and stronger Ontario."

Mr. Speaker, what I have said this afternoon, the program I have just outlined will help my good friend the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) to fulfill that great promise.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T.L. PATRICK (Middlesex, North): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion Agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

House in Committee of Supply, Mr. Patrick in the Chair.

MR. FROST: Page No. 73, the Department of Municipal Affairs, Vote 1 to 5.

MR. T.D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, I see the estimates for this year for the main office are up 85 thousand dollars over last year. Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) care to give an explanation?

(TAKE K FOLLOWS)

Hon. G. H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): First, before I give you that explanation, I would like to say I am sorry the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) is not in his seat. He was accusing the different departments of drawing money during the year and issuing treasury warrants. He said he was not going to escape the Minister of Municipal Affairs because I had drawn $100,000. Now, if he will tell me any way in which I can place in my Estimates for a year when you are paying on the costs of police forces for the previous year and the fire department for the previous yearo and the Children's Aid for the pregious year, on hospi als for the aged on the previous year, if he can tell me how you could come out to the dollar. We don't get our reports until the 31st day of March , therefore, we would not know until April, when we have our accounts to check over, the financial reports from the different municipalities--so that was such a silly remark for a chartered accountant and a man who has been Mayor of a city--and a big city--to say that. The Estimates after all is a guess, is it not? Any person who has been in municipal affairs knows you are estimating--

MR. E. B. JOLLIFFE (Leader of the Opposition): That is not qui e what he said.

AN hon. MEMBER: That is not guessing.

MR. DUNBAR: It is not what he said? What did he say?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Chairman, he drew attention to the fact that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), unlike other hon. Ministers, has had only one

of these treasury warrants. Now, that was a matter of drawing attention to a fact. I did not hear the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Brown) say anything about the hon. minister's (Mr. Dunbar) ability to make guesses.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no, oh, no, but I say it is only an estimate, because you do not know until you see the report from the municipality, then you have to figure it out from there. That is the only way you have of knowing it.

MR. L. E. WISMER (Riverdale): Do you suggest this policy is wrong, then?

MR. DUNBAR: I beg your pardon?

MR. WISMER: Do you suggest this grant policy is wrong?

MR. DUNBAR: No, I do not. I guess I would give you the same reply the hon. Mr. Howe gave an hon. member the other day, when he said: "Your hindsight is better than your foresight".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. E. PARK: (Dovercourt): It is your hindsight, not your foresight.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, you have had so much experience that you would be able to tell exactly what you would be appropriating for the police forces -- 10 per cent -- of say Ottawa or Hamilton. You would know all about how many policemen they put on, before you got their financial statement.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West); You are the one who took on the job.

AN. hon. MEMBER: You are the one.

MR. DUNBAR: Or you, I suppose, knew what that $50,000. home of yours was going to cost, two years before

you built it. You would have a few extras on it, wouldn't you?

AN hon. MEMBER: How about sticking to the Budget?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, it may be that the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) to whom reference was made by the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) a few minutes ago, has not had enough experience to feel that 100,000 here and there makes no difference. He has not had that kind of experience.

MR. DUNBAR: I did not refer to the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park) very seriously at all. He is just a "wisecracker", you know.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh

MR. DUNBAR: To something I asked him for the other day, the very parliamentary reply he gave was "Clean out your ears".

MR. PARK: I beg your pardon, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister (Mr. Dunbar) will find anywhere in the records that I made any such reference as that to which the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) alludes. His imagination is running wild over there.

MR. DUNBAR: All right, perhaps the hon. gentleman beside you.

MR. L. E. WISMER: What?

MR. MILLARD: What do you drink?

MR. PARK: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) wants to get through these estimates, I know he does and we all want to help him get through them, but he should not come in here with such a chip on his shoulder when simple questions are asked of him.

MR. DUNBAR: Do you want salaries?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DUNBAR: The Minister's salary is $8,000., although he is entitled by Statute to $10,000., but we say no. The cost of living has not risen, so therefore we accept the $8,000. instead of the $10,000. The same as it was in 1932.

Now, estimated salaries, present staff, 1951-2. The requirements for the following increased: one supervisor, $4,200; two assistant supervisors, $7,000; four clerks, $8,000; three stenographers, $6,400, making a total of $25,000.

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, are there any of those provincial supervisors, provincial assessors?

MR. BUNDAR: I beg your pardon?

MR. THOMAS (Ontario): Have you taken on any extra staff among your provincial assessors?

MR. DUNBAR: No, we are not taking on any extra staff at all, but you will find salaries of the assessors are increased. One of them had more than the statutory increase. The main man, the supervisor, Mr. Sloan, has had his salary increased to a greater extent than the others who were in a different category.

I can give you what each one of the senior officers was getting; I recommended more. Mr. Orr, $7,500.

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): Not enough.

MR. DUNBAR: $7,500. Mr. Kennedy, supervisor was getting $5,000., but he has gone to the Municipal Board now. Mr. Nunn, supervisor, getting $4,400. Mr. Sloan, supervisor of assessment is getting $4,600. Mr. Hickey, the accountant was getting $3,450. I have recommended him for $900. of an increase. He is a chartered accountant, doing a good job, and I think he has been underpaid.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, Vote 125, Item 10, which provides for the subsidy to the Municipality in lieu of the one bill used to be gven; I want at this stage, Mr. Chairman -- we go down that far -- are we down that far?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No.

MR. ELLIS: I had something to say on the --

MR. DUNBAR: We can come back to any number, sure.

MR. SALSBERG: I am on Vote 125, sorry. I want at this stage to point out that the province seems to continue the policy of putting most of the municipalities, and particularly the large ones like Toronto, into a straight jacket from which it is most difficult for them to extricate themselves. What is happening is that the cities, and particularly the city of Toronto, are obliged to provide millions of dollars to maintain services that have been made necessary by changes that have taken place, but the cities do not derive any income, all of which goes to the province.

MR. DUNBAR: What changes?

MR. SALSBERG: And yet the assistance of the province to them not only is not keeping pace with these additional responsibilities, but is actually depriving on a per capita basis. For instance, the gasoline tax and the motor licence fee brings to this province a very large amount of money, which constitutes at the moment one of the major sources of revenue for the province. This is a reduction of the growing numbers of motor cars that are used by the people. That in turn necessitates expenditure in enormous amounts by the city to build roads, keep them in shape, and repair them so that these vehicles can travel on them. And the more cars we have,

the more trucks they have on the streets of the city of Toronto, the more frequently do the roads have to be repaired and new roads built, and old roads widened. Toronto is now setting aside millions of dollars for the widening of the Lakeshore Road, and it will have to do that in many other areas of the city. What for? It is for the purpose of accommodating the increasing traffic in the city, and traffic coming from out of town. In other words, tens of millions of dollars are spent on maintaining roads for automobiles which paid taxes directly to the province and from which the city gets nothing.

MR. DUNBAR: Just a moment.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not think that policy --

MR. DUNBAR: Just a moment -- just one-third of the total cost.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, we get something for the last year or two.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Attorney General): Then why not stick to the facts?

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, I stick to the facts more than does the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter).

MR. PORTER: You do not stick to the facts at all.

MR. SALSBERG: More than the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) ever sticks. That double-barreled minister --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: -- has a habit of giving any sort of answer to escape the question and get on to the next question. He has a policy of escaping questions, unlike the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) whose policy it is

to answer questions.

MR. PORTER: Stick to the facts. Don't make statements --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. PORTER: I am interested in the truth.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has been out all afternoon --

THE CHAIRMAN: Order.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am answering an interrupter.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) to stick to the point.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sticking, I wonder if you would make the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) stick too.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Because he was out all afternoon and he comes in for a few minutes and cracks wisely - in his own opinion. Please keep out of this.

MR. PORTER: You almost persuade me to go out again.

MR. SALSBERG: My question is only for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), who is more experienced and more capable than the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Porter) is in handling his Estimates when they come up.

To go back to the question. It is true they are getting some increased subsidy for roads construction, but it is not enough. In the case of Toronto, for instance, the grant per capita is less than is the average grant per capita in the province. Now, -- what is it they call them in the city?

AN. hon. MEMBER: Commissioner.

MR. SALSBERG: The Commissioner of Finance has presented to the city facts to show that the grants per upon the province for the last year that he had figures for, 1949, were $609 less than they were for the province as a whole.

(TAKE "L" FOLLOWS)

That, I suggest, creates a situation with an increasing demand made on the municipal governments to provide the services which are necessary but continuously increases the tax rate on the home-owner, and something should be done to stop this very alarming trend, which is going on. There are other items from which the province derives a large amount of income, but which necessitates again further services by the City. Take the liquor outlets. The province derives an awfully lot of money from the sale of liquor in Toronto. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will say: "yes, we derive money, but we are helping to pay the cost of maintaining the Toronto Police Force". But the City is spending a great deal of money as the result of the increased liquor outlets in the City. That is true of a large number of obligations placed on municipal government as the result of changes which bring benefits, financially speaking, to the Provincial Treasury, but nothing to the municipalities, except an outlet for funds, and I would say in regard to those items, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would make a great contribution if he could state now that the contribution will be increased, and an attempt will be made to share with the City some of the taxes they now collect, and which, properly speaking, belong to the municipalities, in a very large share.

As the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) have anything to say?

MR. DUNBAR: I gave you my answer, that we will pay 1/3 of the cost of work being done on the streets, including snow removal, and things of that nature. Two years ago

we did not pay anything at all, so 1/3 is better than nothing.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, but how about a share in the gasoline tax? How about sharing it with the City? How about it?

MR. DUNBAR: That is from the gasoline tax. Where do you think it comes from?

MR. SALSBERG: It may come from the liquor revenue. I suggest the government establish a policy of sharing the gasoline tax with the municipalities so as to return 50% of the gasoline tax to the municipalities where it is sold, on the basis of consumption.

MR. DUNBAR: That is not the government's policy. You mentioned something about the smaller places, the townships and the smaller towns. We know the gasoline tax would amount to a great deal of money in the City of Toronto, but we have to look after those people who are not able to pay, and surely, we give them larger grants. For instance, for the fire and police services, we give them 25%, instead of the 10% we give the cities.

MR. ROBERT THORNBERRY (Hamilton Centre): On item 2 of Vote 125, I notice "Traveling expenses", and I see here an item of "$20,000.00". I notice last year $12,000.00 was spent.

I quite realize that $20,000.00 was just a guess, but would the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) give us a rough breakdown of the $3,710.00 allocated to him for traveling expenses? That sounds a little exorbitant.

MR. DUNBAR: $3,710.00 to me? Where is that?

MR. THORNBERRY: It is right in the estimates

"G.H. Dunbar, $3,710.00".

MR. DUNBAR: I will give you a break-down on that. That was my trip to a Convention in Peru. I will give you a real break-down on that.

MR. THORNBERRY: What went on down there?

MR. DUNBAR: A Municipal Convention was held there.

MR. THORNBERRY: Did we get a report of it?

MR. DUNBAR: I did not only represent Ontario. I represented Canada, and was a speaker at the first night's meeting in Peru. I think it was a credit to the province of Ontario to have a representative there.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DUNBAR: Your Labour Organizers take plenty of trips. I notice recently the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) was abroad on a trip looking after labour business, and I am sure he did not pay his own expenses.

MR. MILLARD: No, and the public did not pay them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this the Provincial-Municipal Conference we have been promised for so long?

MR. DUNBAR: I spoke down there on three occasions.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that when he goes to Peru, he stay away from Bolivia.

I would like to point out that, under "Main Office" last year, the municipality allowed for the corporations' set up, financed at $50,000.00, and I think that was administered by the Department of Municipal Affairs. Am I right?

MR. DUNBAR: No, it is administered by the Treasury Department, under Dr. Walters. My deputy sits in with Dr. Walters,

but it is handled through the Treasury Department.

MR. ELLIS: Then I will go down to Vote No. 10 on Item 125, "To provide for the payment of a subsidy to supplement grants paid in lieu of the one-mill subsidy, $530,000.00". Following the remark by the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) --

MR. SALSBERG: For St. Andrew.

MR. ELLIS: For St. Andrew,(Mr. Salsberg,) that subsidy, as I understand it goes back to 1948 actual, and that in itself has worked great injustice on many of the smaller municipalities who in that particular year had a very restricted budget for expenditures on road improvements. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will agree he has had many complaints, because of going back to the 1948 actual, to strike the subsidy for present operation.

(TAKE "M" FOLLOWS)

I think, myself, that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and the government, would be well advised to bring these actuals up to the present date or at least a year behind; for 1951 use the actuals of 1950 and relieve some of these municipalities which find themselves, having regard to subsidies, pinned back to a time when their expenditures were low.

MR. DUNBAR: That road subsidy which you mentioned is based on last years, but police and fire are not on the previous years. The road subsidy is for the work you did last year with respect to which you paid that amount. One third. But, for fire, police and children's aid it is the following year. You are paying on the budget of 1949 in 1950, not on highways. I always keep right up to date.

MR. DENNISON: Mr. Chairman I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) another question under that sub-item head to provide for the payment of a subsidy in lieu of the 1 mill subsidy. Last year the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) had a few extra words in there. He had in there "as may be directed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs." I pointed out at that time that I did not think that was the proper way of deciding on these subsidies. In that I believe I was supported by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon). The hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett) asked a question this session. The information we get on the amounts which were paid out under that item is rather startling, I think. Some municipalities got practically nothing out of it; others got a great deal. Napean, which is close to the hon. Minister of Municipal

Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) riding, may have been affected by that amalgamation, I do not know, but Napean got $6,787.24.

MR. DUNBAR: What is that?

MR. DENNISON: This is an answer to a question which was on the Order Paper. The question was answered. I refer to votes and proceedings No. 21, Thursday, March 1st, 1951, page 194. The point I would like to make is that Napean Township got $6,787.24. The next highest payment went to Westminster Township, a payment of $5,115.47. Then we come back to Yarmouth, with $3,520.55; Markham with $3,992.00. I have those last two mixed up.

MR. DUNBAR: Is that in respect to police and fire and things like that?

MR. DENNISON: It is in lieu of the one mill subsidy.

Then we have approximately 20 or 30 townships getting in the neighbourhood of $2,000.00 each and finally some up in Renfrew North -- I am sorry the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hunt) is not hear -- getting $5.15 -- referring to Bagot and Blythfield; Bromley got $768.77; Grattan got $22.39; Griffith and Matawatchan got $25.51; Petawawa got $51.43; Raglan got $9.41. I wonder if there is a definite schedule followed in allotting these grants or if they are given at the discretion of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. DUNBAR: No; not at the discretion of the Minister at all; a definite grant for them. If the one mill subsidy is greater than the police, fire and homes for the aged, and children's aid, these are dropped entirely and they receive the one mill subsidy, the same as they are

receiving. No person is to receive less than the one mill subsidy. So, if the other grants do not come to more than the one mill subsidy they are not considered; they get the one mill subsidy.

MR. DENNISON: It seems amazing, though, that the previous grants should have had such a wide fluctuation in the course of just one year, to bring it up to the previous year's grants.

MR. DUNBAR: You mentioned Napean. Parts of it are very densely populated, you might say. You know Westboro and Ottawa West, and the different towns are in Napean. They had police force and fire department before. Therefore their grant would be greater. For instance, take the case of Lindsay which had pretty much a volunteer fire department, consisting of four firemen, you could not expect Lindsay to get the same as the town of Pembroke fire department, which has a permanent fire department.

MR. DENNISON: The point about which I would like to have the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) tell us is, last year it was given at the direction of the Minister. That little clause has been taken out this year. Now, who makes the decision on these grants? Do these people have to visit your office or your Deputy's office to get the grants?

MR. DUNBAR: No.

MR. DENNISON: Are there any negotiations which have to go through?

MR. DUNBAR: No. Not later than March 31 each year, each and every municipality will send its financial statement to our department and we figure from that

financial statement to what they are entitled. Their grants are sent to them. They do not have to write in about it or come to the office, or anything at all like that; their grants will be mailed to them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Do I understand that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is saying that the amount they would get under this grant would be a matter of mathematical calculation by reference to one mill, the police grant, the fire grant, the Children's Aid Society grant and the Homes for the Aged grant? Why, in his opinion, should grants for Children's Aid Societies enter into it? The Children's Aid Society is not the same as a municipality.

MR. DUNBAR: Pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why should the grant of Children's Aid Society enter into the calculation?

MR. DUNBAR: The county, instead of charging the township so much for looking after the Children's Aid, deduct that from the amount they collect from the township. It can be paid to the township direct or it may be paid to the county. It is for the county and the township to settle for the Children's Aid bill, of which we pay 25%.

MR. C.H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Mr. Chairman, I think the difficulty referred to by the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) was that last year the reference to which he referred is on the previous item. That is subject to the Minister's discretion. That is the item of $315,000.00 to mining municipalities.

Last year the hon. members will recall I raised this subject and it was discussed with considerable heat. I lost $5,000.00 fast here, and I got it back again, and

I lost it again. Finally the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) condescended and I think he had his picture taken presenting this $5,000.00 cheque to one of our good, local Tory citizens up North. That was the end of it.

I would like to discuss this matter further on a purely municipal basis to get it down to some concrete foundation. This has been argued for years as to a basis on which this could be equitably distributed. I said before in these estimates and in this answer we got Sudbury gets $100,000.00, Geraldton gets $20,000.00; Larder Lake gets $10,000.00 and Cobalt gets $5,000.00. These are all grants at the discretion of the Minister. I am not saying that these grants are wrong or are out of proportion but I am still arguing for a yard stick to adjust or to measure these grants by. I understand that the mining municipalities of the North have done some extensive research on this subject. They have sent committees down here, they have sat in with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and discussed this problem. They are anything but satisfied with the way it is being administrated. What do we find? The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) moves in on the delegation and agrees to appoint a committee and that ends it. I am just wondering ---

MR. DUNBAR: Just a moment. That did not end it. They had several meetings, referring to that committee and we have our assessors up in Atikokan today assessing Atikokan to compare that municipality with other municipalities so far as assessment is concerned. They are working on it right now.

MR. TAYLOR: I am delighted to hear that from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). I am still looking for the yard stick to decide how you arrive at $100,000.00 for Sudbury and $5,000.00 for Cobalt. I think Sudbury probably could advance a pretty fair argument that they are not getting enough, but, by the same token and yard stick, I am still insisting that with respect to whatever yard stick you use to measure Sudbury you should use the same yard stick to measure all of them. Let us not make it a political football; let us come out in the open. The services you perform are the thing we are measuring this by.

We are performing services for those areas at Cobalt now and all we get for it is the $100,000.00. I am not saying that that is an equitable distribution. I urge the government to listen to this committee which comes down from the north, and adopt their proposals to levy on the basis of population and the services performed rather than try to skate around a separate tax mining law in the province of Ontario for the mining industry, giving them a favoured position as compared to the other industries.

MR. DUNBAR: I would not say that. I do not think we are skating around anything at all. We had so much money to divide and we felt that these poor municipalities were entitled to some. These municipalities you mention were not members to the agreement for five years that we would give them so much money. No matter how mining taxes dropped we kept it up. Take the case of the township of Teck, $123,000.00. The share they received last year went up. We gave Teck an extra grant, so that Teck got quite a bit

more money last year then it got in 1948. I have had a lot of talk with different people and with people in the north country and connecting municipalities regarding just how we could arrive at a yard stick. I do not know whether it would be per capita, those engaged in a certain mine and how would we do in old Ontario? Would you say that the people who worked in the John Inglis plant as compared with North York should get so much per capita? You would not go that far, because it might be misconstrued.

MR. TAYLOR: John Inglis is assessed and pays taxes. The mines in the north are not assessed and do not pay taxes, only on their profits. The mining companies do not pay mining taxes, as you well know; they only pay taxes on their profits. If they have no profits, and what wonderful bookkeepers they are -- and you know it -- they can charge up operations in China, or someplace else, to this industry, and there are no profits. That is what has been going on for years. I think the mining companies are in a preferred position, to this extent, that they are not assessed for anything, only the mine buildings. Then, they are exempt, again, in their milling allowance, which is an antique arrangement from the early days of Cobalt.

MR. GRUMMETT: 1907.

MR. TAYLOR: When the only mill which did any mining or rock crushing was a customs mill. Now these mines are all crushing their own rock, but they are still being allowed a grant in lieu of a crushing allowance of fifty cents a ton. That has been changed of late to 8%. The fact still remains that the mines are in the same preferred position and do not pay taxes on the same basis of any other industry. John Inglis pays taxes from the day it

puts up anything on a vacant lot.

MR. DUNBAR: But not in York Township.

MR. TAYLOR: All we get out of the revenue from these mines is on the profits. They are very good bookkeepers. There are never any profits.

MR. DUNBAR: With respect to your committee which came down here, I suppose you were in touch with them. I did not see where they advertised it very much, when I told them that the mine was there, and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and my Deputy were there, that I thought the mines should be taxed. I still claim the mines should be taxed. That is why I sent assessors to Atikokan; and last year I said in this House why did the mining municipalities not assess one mine and let us compare it with what we had assessed. I did not hear from them. They worked on one mine, all right. They told me that I would not be hearing anything from them. As I explained last year, we are fair; we want to be fair; we want to compare our assessment with their assessment. There is nothing to compare. So that, my stand is in favour of the mines being assessed; do not every make any mistake about that.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hour being now six o'clock I do now leave the Chair and will resume again at eight o'clock.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Department of Education Estimates are coming on after the Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PORTER: I thought I might bring on the Estimates of the Attorney General's Department next, after the Estimates of the Department of Education.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not care. I wanted to give the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) advance notice that we will wish to make mention in the Department of Education Estimates of a broadcast which was made this morning, a school broadcast, one of the series in which the Department of Education collaborates with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation -- usually with very happy results. This particular broadcast to which I refer this morning was one of interest to this House. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation declines to release the text of it on the ground that is the property of the Department of Education. I was wondering if the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) would be good enough to obtain a copy so that it would be available during the estimates of the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: That is possible. I did not know that there was such a broadcast this morning, myself.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): That is when you were in the Attorney General's Department.

MR. PORTER: I do not listen to all broadcasts. I hear too many from the other side. I could not stand it. I could not take it.

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): You are not weakening.

It being six of the clock the Committee took recess.

Toronto, Ont.,
Thursday,
March 15, 1951.

The Committee resumed at 8 o'clock p. m.

MR. C. H. TAYLOR (Temiskaming): Mr. Chairman, under vote 125 I believe I was on my feet when we took recess dealing with the grants to mining municipalities. As I stated, the town of Cobalt last year got a grant of $5,000. I think everybody is familiar with what has transpired there in the last few years, we have discovered some excellent ore in the two new mines in virgin territory and this means that there are approximately 200 more men employed in the mining industry there who reside in Cobalt. These mines are in the Township outside the municipality, therefore, the town as previously stated---I do not think there is any need to rehash it---provide fire protection, education and water and so on for those employees. Now, I should hope that up until such time as we arrive at a yardstick I know the hon. Mi nister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) who formerly resided in that area has a warm spot in his heart for the North and I would imagine if we were entitled to $5,000 in 1949 and 1950 when we did not have these 200 men working, we automatically would be entitled to at least half as much again now in the light of whatever yardstick it was that was used. Until such time as you do arrive at a yardstick I hope the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will see hisway clear to raise it.

MR. DUNBAR: $5,000 now.

MR. TAYLOR: I do not think it is reasonable, if we were entitled to $5,000 then, we are entitled to half as much again with these 200 men.

MR. DUNBAR: Some of the tax is made out of the township.

MR. TAYLOR: Yes, but we provide the service. This bring to mind the need in this Department for a corordination in the Assessment Act. As the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) well knows, the assessment is down low in other municipalities and there is no way of getting them up without an entire re-assessment and I think there is a vast need for that coordination of the Municpal Act, the Assessment Act, and the Department of Mines Act because there is absolutely no coordination between them at the present time. I would urge the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) when this committee reports I think there is need of a yardstick to keep some of these things tied together.

MR. DUNBAR: You mentioned something about no coordination in the Assessment branch. We have spent a lot of time with different municipalities in the Province of Ontario during the past year and with new municipalities like Ajax and the new improved district up at Red Lake and several others like that, we went right in with our assessors and did the complete assessment for them. Now, in your area we put in $50,000 to help put over the assessors in Ontario. Apart from that we figured about $20,000 of that could be used in the North country and districts to pay assessments, but the districts themselves refused to agree. You see, up in your part they had all agreed but Timmins and Timmins said "no". They would not agree. It is only reasonable to think, if they are reassessing Toronto, they could not leave out one Ward and not reassess that, you have to reassess the whole city and if you have a district you have to reassess the whole district and that money has been open for them this year because they have not asked for assessors and it is carried over but we are giving them another chance this year to appoint

assessors.

MR. TAYLOR: I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is referring to the assessment of mines.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no, the properties of the whole district.

MR. W. J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): It is a general overall assessment of the district?

MR. DUNBAR: Assessment of the whole district, yes.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) just how he apportions this $315,000 as between the mines. Now, some of the mines receive a certain amount. For instance, Tisdale gets $46,000; Teck gets $56,000; Whitney $24,000 and the town of Timmins $24,000, whereas the city of Sudbury gets $100,000. Now, the city of Sudbury has been guaranteed this $100,000 for a period of ten years. On what basis do you grant $100,000 per year to Sudbury whereas these other municipalities have got to come to you and ask you for assistance year after year? How do you fix the amount that each municipality gets? It is fixed as far as Sudbury is concerned, they need not worry, they know what they are going to get but Timmins, Tisdale, Teck and the rest of them do not know, they came to you but I do not know just how you figure it out or what yardstick you use to measure the amount coming to Timmins.

MR. DUNBAR: We had a five year agreement, the mining municipalities, that is, Tisdale, Teck, Timmins and the others--

MR. GRUMMETT: Whitney?

MR. DUNBAR: Whitney, they came and agreed to a certain amount. Now, Timmins gets 30 mills; Teck gets 30 mills and

T isdale, of ourse, gets a smaller amount, 20 mills because they agreed amongst themselves to that amount as the need was not there in Tisdale, it was in Timmins but they are entitled o 1½%, which is 15 mills and in the agreement we said we would match that with another 15 mills, we would give them 1½% so that made 30 mills, double what they are entitled to according to the Mining Act, the Mining Tax Act, so we guarantee them that. In Teck, it was $123,600. It does not matter how it drops down. As far as Teck-Hughes or any of those mines closing down they will not get any less than that.

MR. GRUMLETT: Teck was only $56,000 in 1950, the amount received by Teck was $56,000, that is the amount. You may be adding the two together, which would give you $112,000.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, we are but even so, with the Township of Teck you are away out in that, the Township of Teck will get $69 ,225.05 for the mines and we will match that with $69,225.05 so the total amount the Township of Teck will get this year is $138,450.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In the coming year?

MR. DUNBAR: Last year, 1950.

MR. GRUMLETT: But, Mr. Chairman, I asked a question which was answered in votes and proceedings of March 1st, it was no. 21 and your schedule sets out the amounts, sets out all the different municipalities and the first one is the Township of Tisdale and the second is the Township of Teck and in that listing of amounts received by the different municipalities, Teck is s own as receiving $56,025.04. This was prepared by your own Department.

MR. DUNBAR: According to my Estimates, the mining

tax from the mines will be $69,225.05 and we will match that with $69,225.05, making a total of $138,450. They got $123,775.00 last year, they get $138,000 this year, so that will be $15,000 Teck will be getting more this year than they got last year.

MR. GRUMMETT: What is wrong with the figure submitted in answer to my question?

MR. DUNBAR: I do not know.

Hon. W. S. GEMMELL (Minister of Mines): You asked the question, what was received under The Mining Tax Act.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Gemmell) before getting up to enter t is debate should look at the question.

MR. GEMMELL: I am not trying to correct the hon. member (Mr. Grummett) but it is doubled, that is the important thing.

(Take BB follows)

MR. GRUMLETT: Yes, but I asked the question for a specific purpose, Mr. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell). I wanted to know what they got, and this answer should contain the proper figures.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes. What made the difference is---now, you may say this is a secret, it is not a secret---we have a balance in The Mining Tax Act at the end of March 31st. Instead of carrying that over, you understand, the year before, we made an advance to Teck of $12,000.

MR. GRUMLETT: At what time?

MR. DUNBAR: In the month of March. Before the end of this year, but it is under the fiscal year. They got a $12,000 advance. That made the difference, but the total they received last year was $138,450.09, because they had received a $12,000 advance.

MR. GEMMELL: That is correct.

MR. GRUMLETT: How many other municipalities received any advance from that same special fund?

MR. DUNBAR: Only one.

MR. GRUMLETT: Only one?

MR. DUNBAR: Only one. Let me come again and be truthful with you..

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. C. L. MILLARD (York West): That is refreshing.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, if we did not do that, we would not have been able to give Cobalt $5,000, or we would not be able to raise the amount. If we had let that $12,000 go by the way and lost it that year, we would not have been able to give Cobalt that $12,000. By paying that in advance, we could take the amount for Cobalt and for Larder Lake. There is nothing wrong about it.

MR. GRUMLETT: Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), in order to get the record straight, I think I ought to read my question and part of the answer:

> "What municipality or municipalities have received a subsidy upon direction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs out of moneys appropriated in vote no. 125, item no. 9 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1951.
>
> "2. What was the amount of the subsidy received by each municipality concerned?
>
> "3. For what purpose or purposes was each subsidy granted?"

Then you replied as follows:

> "1 and 2. The following municipalities received as at February 2nd, 1951, a subsidy upon the direction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs out of revenue approrpriated in vote number 125, item number 9 of the Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1951, as follows:-----"

And then you list the mining municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. GRUMLETT: Under that, you list the other Townships only, but not the towns or cities. The towns of Timmins and Cobalt are in the mining municipalities, but the other municipalities are only--

MR. DUNBAR: You want all the municipalities in the Province of Ontario?

MR. GRUMLETT: I beg your pardon?

MR. DUNBAR: Do you say you wanted all the municipalities in the Province of Ontario?

MR. GRUMLETT: I am talking about the mining municipalities at the present time, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar).

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes.

MR. GRUMLETT: Now, in connection with these subsidies, on what basis do you justify the granting to Teck, Tisdale, Whitney, Larder Lake, Geraldton, Timmins and Cobalt of a certain amount each year, and have a fixed amount for Sudbury for five years--or for ten years?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. GRUMLETT: On what basis?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I can easily handle that. That was a grant given by the then Minister of Mines, now the hon. Premier of the Province of Ontario (Mr. Frost) in agreement with Sudbury. I did not make any agreement with Sudbury. They were outside the agreement that was with the municipalities I told you about, and it was given just as the $5,000 is given to Cobalt and the $8,000 to Larder Lake and the $10,000 to Geraldton.

MR. MILLARD: What year was that agreement made?

MR. DUNBAR: Surely you would not say it was a political agreement?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): You are anticipating the answer;

MR. GRUMLETT: It was granted during the election, was it not, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar)?

MR. DUNBAR: I could not say that. I did not pay it until the year after.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was promised during the election, but, like many promises, it was hard to live up to.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, of course I did not promise it.

MR. GRUMLETT: Getting back to assessment, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), is it not possible to arrange some method of assessment whereby you take out of your Department and dump in the lap of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell), where it properly belongs, the assessment for mining municipalities? I think the time has come when the mining municipalities have a right to say and to know what their assessments will be without having to come to the Department of Municipal Affairs and depend on a subsidy or a grant. They never know what their revenues will be. I think that this should be left with the hon. Ministe of Mines (Mr. Gemmell) and let him work out some system of assessment satisfactory to all concerned.

The whole difficulty, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is this, the mines have escaped direct taxation over the years. The mining municipalities may not insist on direct taxation, but they want some fixed factor or something that will show them exactly what they will get and give them some idea what their assessment will be and what their taxes will be from year to year, without having to come to the government hat in hand and make a begging application to the government for a subsidy.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, that might be a very good thing, to have the assessment, as I told you--

MR. GRUMLETT: Would you not like to get rid of it?

MR. DUNBAR: But even so, you could not say it is going to give them all they wanted, because here you can read the tax rate is going to have to be raised in Toronto ---you can read that all over the province. If you assess a mine today and they demolish a building and do not require it next year, you would not get any taxes on it. But in this case you are guaranteeing the mine tax, even if the mine is

closed up, we guarantee for five years to pay that municipality, which they said it would be quite beneficial to them, and they were quite agreeable.

MR. GRUMLETT: If they were agreeable, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), why were they down here a couple of weeks ago trying to arrive at another settlement?

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes, that is for renewal after the five years. We make a study of it. I do not see what can be done. If you sign a note, if you sign an agreement for five years, I do not see any change can be made. We are living up to our agreement.

MR. GRUMLETT: Oh, I do not question that, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). I am saying, can we not get together and place the assessment of mining municipalities on a proper and equitable basis? I think we can, if we make an honest effort to do so.

MR. DUNBAR: Where we get our figures from, you said about the mines branch---that is where we get our figures from.

MR. GRUMLETT: Throw the whole thing off to the mines.

MR. DUNBAR: The thing is to keep the payment in one Department. The Department of Municipal Affairs have the different subsidies, and the thing is to pay them through one Department instead of having it scattered through different Departments. That is the only reason.

MR. GRUMLETT: Would you not like to get rid of it by dumping it back in the lap of the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Gemmell)?

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, we do not mind getting rid of all these subsidies as far as that is concerned, but someone has to handle them, and you have to explain it, after all, to the

municipalities. I do not find any trouble handling these municipalities, really and truly.

MR. GRUMMETT: They are down to interview your Department two or three times each year Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). That must be some little trouble to you. The Association of Northern Mining Municipalities are holding meetings every three months or so and they passed some very bitter resolutions about what must be done and a delegation is sent down to interview you. That must be a certain amount of trouble.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no, I am always pleased to meet them. I would not consider that trouble.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, o .

MR. DUNBAR: But you know, some of those municipalities have not been doing too badly. When we started with the police grant and the fire grant, there was an objection which came from your own municipality, and it is interesting to note--take Teck, for instance, they were getting $12,451 in the one mill subsidy and the first year, in 1949, in the form of the police grant they got $12,762---more for the police grant than they got for the one mill subsidy . And they got $12,416 for the firemen, that was only $30 less than the total one mill subsidy. Children's protection grant, they got $3,662. And look what they got in Highways. Before 1948 they were not getting anything, in 1948 they got $23,232.

MR. GRUMMETT: But, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar)--

MR. DUNBAR: But I am telling you about all the grants.

MR. GRUMMETT: Oh, that is all right.

MR. DUNBAR: In 1949 they got $39,471, and the

mining subsidy of course they got $69,270. Relief assistance, $ 21,000, a little increase. Other subsidies, $4,112.

What I want to show you is that Teck instead of getting $129,000 in round figures in 1948, in 1949 they got $162,841, by the change in the grants. So there was no reason for telegrams coming and objecting to the change until they wait and see where they benefit.

MR. GRUMMETT: Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), the figures you have just read off to us have no relation whatsoever to taxation in mining municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes.

MR. GRUMMETT: The figures you have given us apply to other municipalities across this province.

MR. DUNBAR: Absolutely.

MR. GRUMMETT: They received grants to compensate them for the one mill subsidy. Toronto and all the other municipalities received it the same way. That has nothing whatsoever to do with the point I was arguing.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, will you answer me one question?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: You were on the radio the other night.

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: I did not hear you, but did you not say that of $100,000,000 there was very little of it could be traced to the municipalities?

MR. GRUMMETT: That is right.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, I am just tracing that to the municipalities--direct to the police right in your own little town.

MR. GRUMMETT: Those figures you have given us have nothing whatsoever to do--

MR. DUNBAR: They have to do with your radio speech, though.

MR. GRUMMETT: --with what they pay to the mining municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: No, not the mine tax, but they have to the subsidies to the mining municipalities.

MR. GRUMMETT: Well, they are paid, not in the mines tax--

MR. DUNBAR: No, not in the mines tax.

MR. GRUMMETT: --but the other subsidies or the amounts you mention, are paid to all municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: Some of them do not benefit as much as they did.

MR. GRUMMETT: But the mines tax, [illegible] only paid to twelve municipalities altogether, and the others are paid to hundreds of municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You see, Mr. Chairman, the hon.Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will remember that there was some discussion on this point last year under a similar item on the same vote and in last year's Estimates it was shown in this way:

> "To provide for payment of a subsidy to certain municipalities as may be directed by the Minister of Municipal Affairs: Mining, $300,000."

Now, I suppose partly because of what was said last year, the item is a little more discreetly worded this year. It is worded like this:

> "To provide for the payment of a subsidy to stabilize the revenue of mining municipalities."

Now, that language does a little better advertising job, but I suggest that the legal position is exactly the same this year as it was last year, and the point at issue here is that we have in the Estimates of this Department an item

for the disbursement of substantial grants within the discretion of the hon. Mi nister (Mr. Dunbar). Now, that is the point about the difficulty. I understood the hon. Mi nister (Mr. Dunbar) to say a little while ago that he would like to find the yardstick whereby these grants could be paid that would not involve the discretion of the Minister, so that the whims of an individual, if he had any, would not affect the result. I am talking now about the mining municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, stick to that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not talking about the other municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no!

MR. JOLLIFFE: And if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would like to see a yardstick adopted, the kind of yardstick which would make it more or less certain that what one Minister would make the same grants that another Minister would make, in other words, if the grants were determined by law rather than by administrative discretion, then we would be very much further advanced, and I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) to inform us whether his Department has a yardstick in view. Surely this matter must have received a good deal of consideration. Is there a yardstick in view, or will we come back againat another Session to be asked once again to give what is in effect a blank cheque?

Now, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) has been in politics a long time. He knows perfectly well that this whole arrangement is completely inconsistent with our constitution and our system of government. It just does not make sense that we should be asked to vote $310,000 to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) to be paid out as he sees fit to the mining municipalities. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) surely must know it

is not right, and if I were in his position, I would want to correct it as soon as possible.

MR. DUNBAR: Well now, of course there is no use in my reiterating what I said about the agreement before. Outside of Sudbury, there have been a very few small amounts at my discretion, because I have to pay them according to the agreement.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What about the ones that are not under the agreement?

MR. DUNBAR: If you will look at I think it is page 148 in The Assessment Act, the mining assessment, you will find the wording there may be a little more palatable. You may like it better.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did not write it.

MR. DUNBAR: No, but the fact remains that it is in The Assessment Act that I have the power, and that is why in order o adjust it to fix those people at $12,000--that was not that we had a balance, a surplus--we took $4,800 and some odd dollars from Kerr-Addison, because theirs was jumped up so high, you understand to give the little fellow, we were trying to give the little fellow a chance, and as far as I know they were well pleased, all those little fellows were well pleased, it is the people who came down and signed the agreement for five years, and we have lived up to the letter of that agreement.

(Take CC follows)

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, if I may just say a word on vote 125. In regard to the statutary amounts set out here for the police by way of subsidies. In respect to subsidies, may I say that the whole basis is wrong, and I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will agree with me that it is wrong, and as long as he is going to operate on the basis of subsidies, it is not satisfactory to the muncipalities, nor to the government.

It may be that some day in the very near future the government will have to take over some of theresponsibilities which have been passed back to the municipalities. They will have to do away with the subsidies, and take over the cost of education and welfare, and the administration of justice, and get away from the subsidies which are so contentious, and undoubtedly unfair.

On this particular vote I would like to point out the basis on which this subsidy is given to the municipalities is the cost of operating a police department. I wonder what is involved in those costs. When the Act was introduced they did not take into consideration the maintenance of a police station, but last year, I believe they did.

Now we have got to the point where if you set up conditions of employment for your police, which are not set out in the Act, then the subsidy is not payable on this particular social benefit. I will say this to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), and I am sure he will agree with me, that in the municipalities there are efforts being put forward to bring into our police departments the finest type of men we can get hold of, and I think you will agree with me

that it will be necessary to establish a condition of employment which will induce these people to come into the police work.

In Windsor we established not only a 40-hour week for our police depar tment, and what we considered a fairly adequate wage, but, in addition, we have established hospitalization and a medical plan, which applies to our police department. In our opinion, that becomes part of the cost of operating the Department, and I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will agree that is a just cost, as far as any Police department is concerned, in the province.

But what happened? The amount we claimed for the cost of operation of our department, included hospitalization and the medical scheme, and the Department said, "We will not pay that on the basis of the medical scheme and hospitalization, because it is not set out in the Act".

I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) must agree that there is something wrong in the Act, when the total conditions of employment are not eligible for the full subsidy.

I say here that what you have set out is not a complete amount. It is not giving a subsidy for the complete cost of operation of the police department in our municipality. That is one incident I wanted to bring out to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). Accordingly, the Act is not complete in its present form, and must be amended and the municipalities allowed the subsidy on the total cost of operating the police department.

MR. DUNBAR: There is a chain letter going out to the municipalities, that we will pay a subsidy on hydrant

rental. Now, 50% of the public utilities do not charge any hydrant rental. Some charge as low as $7.00, and some as high as $80.00. Would you say we should pay a subsidy on that hydrant rental, that is, paying for water which will be taken out of Lake Ontario, or the St. Clair River? Should we ask the people to pay for the water that is taken out of the Lake there and thrown onto a fire.

We said in this Act they must have a superannuation's scheme, but we did not say they must have sick benefits and hospitalization.

MR. ELLIS: Do you not agree it is important for a Police department to have these benefits?

MR. DUNBAR: Do you know of any Police department which has hospitalization, where the city is paying for it? If you do, I would like to hear about it. I never heard of one.

MR. ELLIS: Windsor has it, and we make an application for the subsidy.

MR. DUNBAR: You have.

MR. ELLIS: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, you are number one.

MR. ELLIS: I assume that others have it, too.

MR. W.J. GRUMMETT (Cochrane South): Mr. Chairman, on Item 10, Vote 125; there is an appropriation this year of $530,000.00. Last year it was $534,000.00.

In regard to the question I asked, and was answered as No. 21 of Votes and Proceedings, the subsidy and other municipalities is listed at $381,255.31. That nearly covers the townships. Cities and towns have yet to be accounted for. I was wondering if the appropriation was not too small and

expenditures might be much more than the appropriation.

MR. DUNBAR: $530,000.00?

MR. GRUMMETT: Yes, $530,000.00 this year, and $534,000.00, last year.

MR. DUNBAR: There was a little too much in that estimate, and it had to be straightened around.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It looks as if there was not enough, because for rural municipalities alone, the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) paid $381,000.00.

MR. DUNBAR: That is the one-mill -- the rural municipalities.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is not understanding. I am not talking about fire and police. The question raised by the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) was that last year it was estimated $534,000.00 was to be paid to municipalities, while it is $530,000.00 as shown on Item 10 of this Vote. Last year you described it as "Other municipalities", but this was set out at page 194 of Votes and Proceedings as totalling $381,000.00, etc. In the answer we see the following:

> "The following municipalities received, as at February 2nd, 1951, a subsidy upon the direction of the Minister of Municipal Affairs out of revenue appropriated in Vote 125, Item No. 9 of the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1951."

And then follows a list of the payments, and then we find this:

> "The payments listed under the item "Other" on schedule 2 were made to carry out the

above mentioned commitment."

"At the date of the Members' query, the payments to rural municipalities onlu had been made."

Now, by the time you get around to paying the other municipalities, these municipalities, other than the rural ones which may be entitled to the grant under the commitment referred to in your answer, you will be paying apparently over the $530,000.00.

MR. DUNBAR: No, because some of them did not have a police force or a fire department, but they have now, and they have had to buy equipment, and things of that kind, and that will be over the one-mill. We feel the portion that we are paying them will all straighten itself out.

MR. GRUMMETT: In towns and cities?

MR. DUNBAR: At the time, in lieu of the one-mill subsidy.

MR. GRUMMETT: We already had the amount in cost in townships. That would apply, but what you just suggest is not towns and cities, and we have no answer as to what was spent.

MR. DUNBAR: What number are you at?

MR. GRUMMETT: No. 10, and referring again to the question I asked, which you will find in Votes and Proceedings No. 21, on page 193.

MR. DUNBAR: Here is one given in the Police Act. In 1949, it was $1,363,212.00; in 1950 it was $1,680,000.00. I am not going by Votes and Proceedings. I have the estimates here. I am not answering your question now; I am giving you what is in these estimates. For the Fire Department there is

an increase of $266,909.00, not a decrease; that was 316 of an increase for police, and in regard to children's protection, there is an increase of $177,540.00, and the homes for the aged are increased by $123,175.00, and increased benefits under the local Improvement Act of $217,687.00, and the guaranteed payments by the Department of Municipal Affairs is increased by $116,249.00. So we have put in the estimates this year as paying the municipalities for the one-mill subsidy, for the police, $975,844.00 more than we did the year previously. That is the estimate.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I am not getting an answer to the question put to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), because apparently he does not follow the question raised.

MR. DUNBAR: No, I only have the estimates before me.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The estimates are only guess work; here we have the Gospel.

MR. DUNBAR: What does the word "estimate" mean?

MR. MILLARD: It means you are guessing.

MR. DUNBAR: Absolutely. An estimate means you are guessing. Why be so small. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) thinks an old man has no place in this world, because he is an Oxford student.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is getting a little way from home.

MR. DUNBAR: No, getting a little thick.

MR. JOLLIFFE; Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) look at page 194 of the Votes and Proceedings, and I have marked the figure, about 30% of the way down the page, "$381,255.31".

(TAKE"DD" FOLLOWS)

That is the total of the amounts thus far paid to the other municipalities, under vote 125, item 9 of last year, which is represented this year by item 10 of the same vote. Now, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) sees that total of $381,000.00. You estimated last year $534,000.00.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You may have estimated a little too low, because if you will now turn to page 200 of Votes and Proceedings -- about 62% of the way down the page --"at the date of the member's query," the final paragraph "the payments to rural municipalities only had been made."

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: In other words, you still have to calculate how much will be paid to other than rural municipalities if they have anything coming to them under the subsidy for which you are estimated $534,000.00 last year. Now, is it not possible that the amount due to them will be considerably larger than the difference between $334,000.00 and $381,000.00?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You agree with me?

MR. DUNBAR: I agree with you, but the estimates we have is that the rural municipalities will only require $440,000.00 . Perhaps we want to be sure, but our estimate is that it will only require $440,000.00.

MR. JOLLIFFE: From where did that figure come?

MR. DUNBAR: That comes from the Department.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where is it in the estimate, the $530,000.00?

MR. DUNBAR: You said it was not enough. I am

telling you they put in quite sufficient, more than the figures required. You are criticizing me one time for not putting in enough and the next time for putting in too much.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) saying he put in another $90,000.00 to be on the safe side?

MR. DUNBAR: Pardon?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is the estimate $440,000.00, or $530,000.00?

MR. DUNBAR: Between that and $530,000.00 ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why is it not $530,000.00 in the estimate?

MR. DUNBAR: That is what you said, and you can not back out of it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us not get mixed up.

SOME hon. MEMBER: It does good to get mixed up sometimes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: For the moment let us consider one thing at a time. With regard to the year 1950-1951 the rural municipalities have been paid, and it took over $381,000.00, or so we were told in answer to the member's question. The other municipalities have not yet been paid. Now, when they are paid is the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) not likely to be over the $534,000.00 for the year 1950-51, or is he going to be comfortably inside it?

MR. DUNBAR: I think we will be comfortably inside it. We have $534,000.00. We might get off at $440,000.00. We are not going to throw that money away; we are going to have it, but, still, you say perhaps we have not estimated

high enough.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I will tell you how we can settle it very easily. Here we are at the 15th day of March. The fiscal year has only 16 days to go. Would the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) be good enough to get from the Department what has been paid down to the 15th of March to the municipalities other than the rural municipalities which were shown in answer to the member's question. Then we would know whether you are likely to be under-spending or over-spending last year's estimate.

MR. DUNBAR: But, you say we have not enough.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not know, but I think you should be able to tell us what you paid to the other municipalities. The fiscal year ends March 31. Surely you are not going on making payments in the next fiscal year out of money appropriated for this year.

MR. DUNBAR: It is not all paid on March 31. You know there is a month to settle up all the accounts. There may be some of the municipalities have not sent in a request yet. We have great difficulties in having municipalities send in a report.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, am I to understand from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) that through the whole of the year, from April 1, 1950 down to the day the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) answered this question -- the second or the first of March -- nothing had been paid in lieu of the one mill subsidy to any other than rural municipalities? Are we to believe that?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Nothing had been paid to any other

than the rural municipalities?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes. If there was a town which did not have sufficient to come over the one mill subsidy, it received it, or would have received it later.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then, why was it not given in the answer to the question?

If you look at page 200, again, you say that"at the date of the member's enquiry payments to rural municipalities only had been made." When are these other municipalities, if they are entitled to anything to be paid -- this year, or next year?

MR. DUNBAR: They will be paid.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Out of last year's vote, or the vote for the coming year?

MR. DUNBAR: They will be paid out of this year's we are finished up with. They will be paid out of this vote.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But, you still do not know whether you will be under or over.

MR. DUNBAR: No; and there is not any man living, wearing shoeleather today, who can give you that answer with respect to estimates. They are just estimates. There is not a man living who could tell you the answer to the unfair question you have asked me.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think it is an unfair question.

MR. DUNBAR: You know it is.

MR. L.E. WISMER: (Riverdale): Continuing on this same vote, No. 10, Mr. Chairman, has the Department received any accounts from any municipalities other than

the rural municipalities which are listed in the answer to this question?

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, certainly. I signed a lot today for the police ---

MR. WISMER: No, no.

MR. DUNBAR: What do you mean?

MR. WISMER: It says on page 73, vote 125, No. 10: "To provide for the payment of a subsidy to supplement the grants paid in lieu of the one mill subsidy, $530,000.00" It has been mentioned by the hon. member for Cochrane, South (Mr. Grummett) that that figure was in the same item, $534,000.00, and you have indicated, in answer to a question from the hon. member for Cochrane South (Mr. Grummett) that $381,000.00 odd of that money has been paid out to rural municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: It has been.

MR. WISMER: It also says that as of February 2 you had not paid money out to any other municipality.

MR. DUNBAR: Said what?

MR. WISMER: Said that you had not paid out any money under this item. It says that you have not paid that out. My question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs(Mr. Dunbar) is ---

MR. DUNBAR: Do you mean it says we have not paid money out on police and fire?

MR. WISMER: Let me read your own language to you, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). I refer to page 200 ---

MR. DUNBAR: Never read it and never saw it.

MR. WISMER: I suggest the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) now look at it with me. There is a

rather interesting text here. It says on page 194, at the top of the page, "The Minister of Municipal Affairs replied as follows."

MR. DUNBAR: Well, look ---

MR. WISMER: I am looking. You look.

MR. DUNBAR: Have you ever read what Mr. Howe said, when some member asked him in the House of Commons "Did you sign that letter?" He said "Yes; but I never read it." One has to have officials upon whom one can depend.

MR. WISMER: That is right.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that we have been to Ottawa and back, the evidently very able members of the Department of Municipal Affairs, set down under the name of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), the following at page 200, Votes and Proceedings: "At the date of the members' query ---" This is 62½% down the page. "---the payments to rural municipalities only had been made." If this english language anything it means you have not paid anything to anybody else. My question to you now is have you the accounts in from the other municipalities?

MR. DUNBAR: You mean requests for them?

MR. WISMER: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: Certainly. They send them in because they would be very foolish to borrow money from the bank when they can get the money from us.

MR. WISMER: I wonder if we could have a good guess as to how much money that would amount.

MR. DUNBAR: How much money was paid out to date, as of six o'clock this evening?

MR. WISMER: No; how much are these additional claims, requests, of urban municipalities?

MR. DUNBAR: I would not know. I would have to go to the accountant and get the number which have not sent in their claim for the one mill subsidy.

MR. MILLARD: How many have sent in, and what is the bill?

MR. DUNBAR: What is that?

MR. MILLARD: What is the amount of the claims you now have?

MR. DUNBAR: You do not total it up every evening to see how many municipalities have sent in that day, and total the amount of money.

MR. WISMER: I wonder if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) might indicate what the deadline is for municipalities to make such claims.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, the deadline should be the 31st of March, but we have stretched it and we have made it during the month of April, when other bills are being settled.

MR. WISMER: March 31 of what year are you working on?

MR. DUNBAR: When?

MR. WISMER: Let us get it straight with respect to this. You have $534,000.00 to spend out of money voted by this Legislature at this time last year. That is the money, presumably, you are spending. What was the deadline, what was your official deadline, whether it was kept or not, for the municipalities to make claims for that money?

MR. DUNBAR: What was our official deadline?

MR. WISMER: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: March 31, but we did a few times with respect to rural municipalities which had not good clerks, who had not been looking after their affairs, we did not want to have that municipality lose that money and we paid it during April.

MR. WISMER: Well, all right.

MR. DUNBAR: We have done that in the past.

MR. WISMER: That was March 31, 1950, I gather, that you are talking about, one year ago.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes; or, seven years ago, we did the same thing.

MR. WISMER: Well, what I am trying to get at is these people who have not been paid, these municipalities who have not been paid, whether you have claims or not. This is money which they had in their accounts and spent against not in 1950 but in 1949 and they have not been paid yet in 1951. Is that right?

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, yes; they have been paid. There is always a line, 30 days over, when books are closed. The end of April. We do not want to take a little municipality, because the Clerk is just on his job or something like that, by the throat and say "you did not put in your claim on a certain date and you will not get one dollar." We do not do business that way.

MR. WISMER: I am not suggesting that, either; what I am suggesting is that these claims which were not paid on the 2nd February, 1951 are municipal claims made, or which should have been made, by March 31, 1950, and that, therefore, municipalities in this province, as far

as this answer is concerned and anything the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has indicated yet, are still waiting for money which they should have received for their 1949 fiscal year.

MR. DUNBAR: Oh, no. Some of them are waiting for their 1950 which they could have received in June or in July, in 1950, had they taken the care to send in their report. We want to know what the amount is. We have to get that statement from them and surely it is not too much to use an envelope and buy a stamp in order to send them in when they are going to get a cheque. That is all that is holding it up. We have the money and we are ready to pay it right out the next day, as soon as the cheque comes with the financial statement.

MR. PARK: Not on this particular point, Mr. Chairman, but on another point I would like the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) to give us some idea as to the attitude of the government on the question of the improved districts. I have in mind the situation on Atikokan. I would like to know when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) thinks self government will come to that part of the country up there.

MR. MILLARD: No.

MR. PARK: For the steep rock iron ore workers. They have been under an improvement district set up for some time. The citizenry is a little restless about it, as I am able to judge from my association with the workers in the mines up there. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would care to make a statement as to when he thinks home rule can be given to Atikokan.

(TAKE "EE" FOLLOWS)

MR. DUNBAR: Well, the Act states that after three years on the request of the people in a district it can be changed, so any time Atikokan makes a request to be made into a village or town we will be only too glad to do so. We can give them a vote and let them decide. However, Atikokan has been fairly well looked after. We were paying them a bonus and when the mines dropped off and they had no profits we helped the rate payers of Atikokan, we put in the bill with the amounts which were paid the year prior, carried it through at the full amount so it would not be cut down, so we gave them not only their own business but the amount the Steep Rock Mine had paid the previous year. I think that was pretty good.

MR. PARK: Well, to leave the northwest for a moment and to come to item 12 of Vote 125, "Payment to the city of Toronto to meet the province's portion of the cost to landscape University Avenue", the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) may know there was a very serious controversy in the City Council here as to what kind of trees should line the Avenue. He might also know in the end it was resolved to import the trees into Canada. The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Scott) may be interested to know that they are importing Norwegian maples via Holland, they are being brought in to do University Avenue. I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would tell us what side he was on in the controversy?

MR. DUNBAR: We never interfere in the city's business. We offered to pay half the cost, up to $60,000., we offered $60,000. two years ago. Now they claim it will only cost $22,000. so we are going to pay $11,000, half that amount.

MR. F.O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) and I would like to seek from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), the policy of his Department in connection with the question raised, with the question brought forward by the various municipal associations that serious thought be given to relieving the municipalities of the cost of welfare, the cost of education and those costs which have been argued down through the years should not be a charge on real estate. Now, we realize there may be some reason, probably Federal-Provincial agreements that have to be reached before we can arrive at that day and in the meantime some form of grants such as the police and fire grants are certainly very acceptable to the municipalities. However, I would say that various municipal associations have brought forward very clearly year after year that it is their desire if the various higher levels of government, however they may work it out but relieving the municipalities of those costs which are not properly chargeable to real estate. I would appreciate it very much if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) would give us some idea of the road ahead on that channel as his Department sees it.

MR. DUNBAR: We are not interested -- no, I am not saying that our Department is not interested but that is government policy and I am only speaking on the estimates.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You are a member of the government.

MR. DUNBAR: But I am not setting the policy of the government, there is a Cabinet, we are not a one-man government, the Cabinet sets the policy and the private members are called in for a caucus when anything is done.

None of this one-man government for us.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If there is anything at all in the proposition then the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) should be able to make a policy on a matter which comes in the sphere of his Department.

MR. DUNBAR: It is something the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) talked about to the municipalities not two months ago and they, of course, admitted that it would cost 85 million dollars or 90 million dollars for to do that, more than we are paying. That is a considerable amount of money. We consider we are doing pretty well by putting over 10 million dollars extra in this year to assess the municipalities but so far as a government policy we have not considered that.

MR. NIXON: May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) an easy one now? With regard to item 11, "payments to counties and districts to assist in the cost of county and district assessors", how general is that appointment of county assessors over the province now and what part of the cost do you pay?

MR. DUNBAR: It is getting along pretty well with the county assessors. About half the counties now -- there are three with two going in, one to be appointed any day and another considering it but there is $15,000. we pay each county as a grant to pay their county assessor. That is $1500.00.

MR. NIXON: Do you have to approve of the person appointed and approve of their salary?

MR. DUNBAR: No, absolutely not, that is one thing that I will not allow them to do, my Department has nothing

to do with appointing assessors.

They call in and have a certain number of men to question and if they ask our assessors to go and find out if the men would make good assessors we will do that but only at the request of the municipality.

MR. ROBINSON: I would like to clarify another point, going back for a few minutes to what the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) said about hydrant rental, I am not clear on what the policy of the Department is. Do they feel that hydrant is not a proper charge against fire costs?

MR. DUNBAR: No, we do not.

Vote No. 125 agreed to.

On vote 126.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): Mr. Chairman, under 126, the Ontario Municipal Board, I have an item which I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). It is a general item under this vote, it has not to do with any particular item of 1, 2 and 3, it is to deal with the vote as a whole. I would like to say before I bring this to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that I am afraid he is guilty tonight of a little bit of exaggeration. He mentioned the $50,000. home I have and I say he has just doubled the amount of someone else who attacked me for my swell home out in the sticks, he said $25,000.00, you have doubled it to $50,000.00.

MR. DUNBAR: I have seen a photograph, I was going to ask you if you would let me live in the garage.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: Of course, I consider as you have said that these estimates are just guesses anyway and I think that has been indicated from the various financial

critics who have pretty well shown that even the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Frost) estimate of our revenues and expenditures are pretty much guess work. This item, Mr. Chairman, has to do with an application which was made by the municipality of Swansea to the Municipal B oard and in the latter part of August I brought it to your attention by writing you a letter to which I received a reply to which I will refer in a few moments. This proposition was the fact that a business concern decided to locate in a point in Swansea that was under a residential restriction by-law and so they went to the municipality, to the Council and the Council apparently agreed to make an application to the Municipal Board to have that restriction lifted by another by-law. I would like to put on record here, because it is one of the most fantastic stories I have ever run into as to how this particular department works. I have a letter here and I will vouch for the authenticity of the letter. It is dated August 24 and it comes from a very reputable firm of solicitors and barristers here in the city of Toronto. I would like to put it on record and read it to the hon. members of this House because it tells its own story. It was written to me and it is " re: Swansea By-law and Fruehauf":

> "Confirming your telephone conversation with our Mr. C.D. Kingsmill on the 23rd August, 1950, we set before you the facts in the matter of the approval by the Municipal Board of Swansea By-law, lifting the residential restrictions of a certain area in that municipality to enable Fruehauf Trailers Ltd. to establish a Repair Depot

on land previously owned by the Steel Company of Canada.

We are spending you these particulars at the request of Mr. Prosser, for whom we do not act (his sollcitor being Mr. Ross of Kennedy & Ross). However, Mr. Prosser's interests parallel those of our clients, Mr. Molloy, Mr. Bailey and others who have homes on Runnymede Gardens. Mr. Prosser has been most helpful in assisting our case which was presented before the Municipal Board, hence we wish to assist him in placing the fact before you for such action as you see fit."

I would like to interject there, that these people came to me about this matter and I said I thought they should proceed to the Municipal Board for the hearing without my presence, that it might be deemed to be some politics being played at that stage and they followed my advice.

"From a legal point of view, we appear to have reached a dead end. The by-law was passed by the Municipality, and sent to the Municipal Board for approval. At the B oard, evidence was heard on 2nd June, 1950 ---"

I hope every hon. member will keep that date in mind for a moment or two because this letter, as I have stated, is dated August 24, more than two months later.

"At the Board, evidence was heard on 2nd June, 1950 by Mr. Rowland and Mr. Wright, from various home owners, from Fruehauf and from the Village of Swansea. The Board

reserved it's decision to consider and to view the premises. The Board gave counsel about a week to submit written arguments, which are on file with the B oard, and might prove interesting reading for you. We understand copies are being sent to you by Mr. Prosser or his associates.

We checked from time to time with the B oard and found that a decision has not been given. Eventually the Board advised us that Mr. Rowland went away on his holiday without giving a decision. On the 9th of August, ---"

Hon. members will keep this in mind, from the 2nd of June till the 9th of August, efforts were made to get a report or the decision of the Board, then they learned that one of the members of the B oard who heard the case and would obviously be making the decision was away on holidays.

"On the 9th of August, we checked with the Deputy Clerk of the Municipal Board and were once more advised that the approval had not been given, but due to outside information reaching us to the contrary, we checked again in the afternoon of the 9th, spoke to a Miss Vickers who got out the file and informed us that the Board's Order was issued, dated 2nd June, 1950, (the date of the hearing but before written argument by counsel had been reserved) approving the By-law, and that copies were sent to all

parties favouring the By-law. The copies were put into the mail, we understand on 9th August, 1950. Those protesting were not sent copies of the Order (this firm, Kennedy & Ross and H.S. Honsberger, Esq., K.C.) we understand were not informed. Certainly this firm received no copy of the order, and as a result we visited the the Parliament Buildings and obtained one.

From a study of the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1937, Chapter 60, Sec. 100 (3) the decision of the B oard is final, and no appeal lies in By-law approval matters. (There is an appeal in such matters as arbitration, questions of law (not fact) jurisdiction etc., but such appeal shall not lie unless leave to appeal is obtained from the Court within one month after the making of the order ---. (Sec.103). The order in question was back-dated to 2nd June, 1950 so that had an appeal on a question of law been possible we would have been met with an objection (not unsurmountable) that the appeal was filed late.

However, Sec. 49 provides that the Board "may rehear any application before deciding it, or may review, rescind, change, alter or vary any decision, approval or order made by it." This seems to be the only recourse left.

Now as to the reasons for the Board's

decision as you no doubt know, it is not required to give "Reasons for Judgment" as in a Court."

(TAKE "FF" FOLLOWS)

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman and hon. members of this House, that that is a big proposition, that the Board is final and is not required to render any reasons for their decisions. We heard here already in this House in this Session where even a policeman cannot be discharged from here on out without being supplied with reasons for his dismissal.

> "It is, therefore, difficult for contesting parties to deduce how the Board arrives at the decisions it does. In the present case, the Board was provided with numerous petitions for and against the lifting of the residential restrictions. Many signed both petitions, and in many cases, individuals signed who did not own land (i.e. a wife when land in name of husband alone.) Further people like Mr. Bustard and Mr. Prosser represented a great deal of land, which would be equivalent of dozens of home sites when sold and built upon. Again many signing for the by-law owned commercial premises and could lose nothing by the commercialization of the area. Nevertheless our opinion was that the majority of the land owners, and particularly those most vitally affected (those who owned the most expensive homes in the district on Runnymede Gardens) were overwhelmingly opposed. The Board may mave found otherwise.
>
> The Board reserved decision to view the premises. We do not know whether or not they did so.
>
> If, in your investigations which we understand you are willing to make on behalf of

Mr. Prosser and his fellow land owners, you are able to find the answers to any of these questions or obtain "Reasons for Judgment", or any indication that the Board would re-open the matter under Section 49 of the Act, we would be glad to hear of same as soon as possible.

As to an injunction against Fruehauf, which was mentioned as a next stop, we do not recommend the same from a legal point of view as,

(a) There would be no chance of obtaining one, in our considered opinion.

(b) It would be "throwing away" the money of our clients.

(c) Fruehauf might sue for damages caused by any frivolous action brought against them which would delay their construction. This possibility would be ruinous to our clients, who are not men of wealth.

As we have mentioned before, an appeal lies only on a question of law. There is no "law" that states the Board must give the decision of the wishes of a minority of say 10% of the land owners, or 15% or even 50%. It is a question of fact that some opposed and some were in favour, and the numbers for and against is a question of fact. The "findings or determinations of the Board upon any question of fact within it's jurisdiction shall be binding and conclusive" (Sec. 100 (3).

We trust that this letter has given you some particulars which will assist you and Mr. Prosser."

As I said before, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), I subsequently wrote you a letter soon after that date, and I received a reply from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) I think very little later, although I do not have the letter with me. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) pointed out in substance that he did not wish to interfere with the Board. Now, all I request is of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) in my letter was that he should speak to the Board and ask them if they would have a rehearing of the case in order that I might appear before the Board and present the facts. But by the time I got the letter back from the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), having this all gone on before, I realized that it was no use to make any further representations either to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) or to the Board, because the fact is that while more than two months elapsed before this law firm could get a copy of that Order, and while it was back dated from the 9th of August to the 2nd of June, the fact is that the company must have had some inside information because they started to prepare the land about the 3rd or 4th of June, right after the hearing. They got their steam shovels and their apparatus in there to go right ahead with the construction, to prepare the land for putting in their piles.

Now, Mr. Minister (Mr. Dunbar), the point I want to bring to your attention is, what protection is there for the little fellow? Here a group of people went to work and in a restricted residential area they built their homes and without any question of them, an application is made to the Municipal Council and through the Municipal Council to the Municipal Board, a hearing is conducted, the pros and cons of the case considered. The Board says: "We will reserve decision and we want written argument and we are going to go out and see the premises," and then nine weeks elapsed and first of all the

excuse is given that one of the Board is gone on holidays and then finally we get a copy of the Order and we find out that it is dated June the 2nd and apparently both the municipality and the company knew of that situation from the time of the hearing.

I have here a copy, Mr. Chairman, of the order of the Board. It is dated Friday the 2nd day of June, 1950, the very day of the hearing, though decision was reserved, as the order itself points out:

> "Upon the application of the said corporation for approval of the said amending by-law number 1294 and upon consideration of material filed and the same having come on for hearing this date before Mr. Rowland, member, and Mr. Wight, member of the Board, in the Board's Chambers in the Parliament Buildings,------"

and I would just skip the other, which is recounting the people who appeared and made representations, and the last part of that paragraph reads thus:

> "Upon the application being reserved for consideration and the same coming before it this day for decision, the Board orders under and in pursuance of the provisions of section 406 of the Municipal Act-----",

And then it gives the references to the various sections:

> "-----that it be and the same is hereby approved."

That is, the new by-law rescinding the previous by-law and taking off the residential restrictions. Now, Mr. Chairman, the property value that went into those working class homes in that area was decreased by at least 25% by this arbitrary action of the Board, on the representa-

tions of the Freuhaf Company and the Steel Company of Canada apparently who were selling the land, and the municipal council. And I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) what redress, what help is going to be extended to people who in good faith and good conscience invest their money to try to surround themselves with a decent little home, they put it in a residential restriction area, then somebody comes along and without any planning board or anybody else, the Municipal Board says, behind the scenes: "Go ahead," and they give an order, back dated apparently.

Now, either this was granted and the company knew that they were safe in proceeding on the 2nd day of June, or after the member of the Board returned from his holiday the order was granted and backdated to that time in order to legalize anything that they had done up to that time. And I say by that time it was an impossibility to make representations on behalf of these people with any hope that anything could be done in the situation. The commitment apparently had been made, the company had proceeded with construction preparation, they had their machinery on the lot, they had the lot levelled, they had the steam shovels and everything there, they had their pile drivers and whatever was required to remedy that land and make it fit for construction.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) very frankly, what can be done in a situation like this to protect the interests of the little man, the little fellow who invested his money in good faith, built his home only to find a factory or a virtual factory stuck under his nose, right next to his front door, and then he has to take the depreciated value and instead of finding himself living in a residential area, he finds himself living in a commercial

or industrial area.

Now, surely we can plan so that a man m ay build with the knowledge that he is building in a restriction area or that he is buying in a residential restriction area. In this case I wanted to make representation to the Board, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) had spoken to the Board Chairman and tried to arrange a hearing in this case, which is permitted under the Act. That is all I wanted the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) to do. I did not want him to interfere with the Board's decision, I just wanted to make presentations on behalf of these people who are interested in this situation. As I say, all I wanted to was to tell the B oard that one of the members of the town council had gone down and interviewed the situation at the time before the Board hearing, and that that member of the town council agreed that the restriction should not be lifted. But in spite of that the solicitor for the village council appears before the Board, the solicitor for Fruehauf Trailers appear s before the Board, and the solicitors appearing for the residents in the area apparently were disregarded in the matter or they did not have a strong enough case to stand up against the case which was presented by the other people.

My question to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is, what are we going to do, what can this Legislature do, what is the government going to do in a situation of this kind?

Now, we have a Planning and Development Board, we have all this question of "Green belts," and here was waste property that had been bought some years ago by the Steel Company of Canada, and it was in a residential section, and yet the restrictions were lifted at the request of the industrialists and the muncipality in this case, and apparently the home owners that had built their homes there have no redress whatsoever.

Now, is there any answer to that problem?

MR. DUNBAR: It is something that is occurring throughout the province in the large cities and towns, in places where restrictions had been placed on property and conditions had been changing, things expanding, growing; take, for instance in the city of Toronto we will take Jarvis Street. There were restrictions there years ago, and that has changed and the requirements were lifted. Take any city, you will see conditions changed and the council ask for the restrictions to be lifted.

Now, evidently this council approached the Board, made application to the Municipal Board to hear this case and the Board said: "Yes, we will visit the scene," and I do not know anything more. It is an independent Board, I never could be accused of interfering with them, because I will not have anything to do with them, because they are supposed to be a semi-judicial Board.

MR. MILLARD: They are not untouchable, are they?

MR. DUNBAR: No, but you would not think I should go to this Board and say: "Here is some fellow who is a good friend of mine or who I know is a supporter of the Party, give him a break when he is before you in the Board"?

MR. J. B. SALSBERG (St. Andrew): You would not do that.

MR. DUNBAR: How would it be if I went to a Judge or a Magistrate and said that? They are in the same class. But now you have given this statement in the House, I will ask the Board, I will take from Hansard the statement you have made and find out just exactly what happened. I could easily understand during the past Summer that they would be some time deciding, but you say it was back dated, that is one thing I could not understand. But they have been quite busy, you know.

MR. HILLARD: That is one of the most over-worked Departments you have got.

MR. DUNBAR: It is very much over-worked, and Mr. Wight of course went back to Ottawa and we were short until we put Mr. Kennedy in and Mr. Near has been ill for three or four months with a heart attack and is down South at the present time. It is very much over-worked but I will certainly draw their attention to this fact.

However, any person who has been connected with a municipality knows it is a pretty difficult question for the Board to decide. A municipality makes application, the restriction has been on there and the local people---you talk about us interfering with local autonomy, but here is this municipal council which makes an application to the Board and if the Board decides against the small property owner, as you state it did in t is case in favor of the Steel Company, they are not doing it on their own, they were requested to hold a hearing by the local council.

(Take GG follows)

Which, after all, goes again to prove that the Board does fill a very important function in the municipalities and the province, when they are called upon to come between the councils and the residents in order to settle disputes of that kind. Not so many of them turn out the way yours did --

MR. MILLARD: I hope not.

MR. DUNBAR: Most of them are very satisfied. It is very difficult to say that the Board did not use good judgment, because somebody else might look over the situation, and think that they did use good judgment.

MR. MILLARD: I just want to add, because I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) ought to know this -- in one of the submissions made on behalf of the home owners in the area, the last item which appears before the Board contains this statement:

> "There is no question but that the owners of the homes abutting on this property would not have purchased it if they had had any idea that the residential restrictions on this land would be waived".

MR. DUNBAR: Is that from their lawyer?

MR. MILLARD: Yes. They just would not have purchased there. They made their investment, and I think it is a safe assumption to say that the value of their property, on which many are still paying no doubt by way of mortgage principal and interest -- went down at least 25%. Surely, if they were going to lift these restrictions, and a very wealthy corporation is going to construct buildings there, they could have been compensated to some extent, and frankly

I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) will appreciate the situation in Swansea, where they have very little industrial land, so the City Council had a special interest in trying to attract and get industry located, but that should have been thought of before this vacant land was built upon. The area upon which this restriction was lifted was owned by one of the large corporations, The Steel Company of Canada, and that land should have been retained for industry.

MR. DUNBAR: Was the land on which the Steel company was located owned by them prior to the building of the homes?

MR. MILLARD: No, they owned the land, and it was purchased by Freuhoff, and they had to have the restrictions lifted. Freuhoff went to the Municipal Board and the restrictions were subsequently lifted. I do not think there was anything underhanded in this thing, but it is most unfortunate if working people who only have a very limited amount of money, and can only build moderate homes, find that their investment has depreciated. I think that is something which should be rectified, and if it prevails elsewhere, we should find some solution whereby these people, if we are going to reverse the residential restrictions upon such land, should be in a position where they may be compensated by the person who is going to benefit by the lifting of those restrictions.

In this case it was a wealthy corporation, and surely the little people concerned, should not be the victims of this thing any longer.

MR. WILLIAM DENNISON (St.David): The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) said he does not interfere with the Board in any way, and I believe he is telling the truth. But would it not

be logical for this Legislature, through the government of this province, to sort of draw up with the Municipal Board certain policies which might be followed in cases like this?

I will give you two more examples, where I think the decision of the Board has helped to destroy an area. A short time ago, in a little lane off Gerard street east, a man wanted to get the right to set up a spraying and paint shop, where he could paint cars, and do work on bumpers, and so forth, and the neighbours around there did not want him. There was a poll taken. In the meantime he went about, and he just about got a majority, but there was still a majority against him. The Planning Board of the city of Toronto was against him; the Property Department was against a paint shop going into that area, which is surrounded by houses, and they said he was not to go in there. Eventually it came before the Municipal Board, and the paint shop went in. That is one example.

I can think some years ago when the Highland Dairy went in to Ontario Street, the people started to complain, because they were not able to sleep at night on account of the noise of the bottles going through the bottling machine.

Then we might consider the corner of Isabella and Jarvis Street -- mention has been made here of Jarvis Street. The city of Toronto spent $6,000,000.00 to extend Jarvis Street, and the Planning Board said: "You should not allow any gasoline service station to be established along that route, because it will be dangerous to traffic", but despite that, the Sun Oil Company applied

for the corner of Isabella and Jarvis Street. There was a vote taken, and they voted 10 to 1 against the Company getting that corner.

But in a Council, as you know, they get around the two local Aldermen, and one man might oppose it, and then give in, and the thing passed the city Council. Pressure can be put on there in devious ways.

The thing came to the Municipal Board and there was still a petition from the people, and the Planning Board and the Property Department, but the Municipal Board said, "Yes, go ahead, and put the Service Station there".

That was destroying to some extent the value of the people's property; it was destroying to some extent the value of that new $6,000,000 investment which the City had made, and I think the Municipal Board might very well adopt a policy of restraint in these matters, and adopt a long-range attitude, and not a specefically local interest, and I think that would be of great assistance to the municipalities.

According to the officials, there is plenty of lands set aside for factories and paint shops and service stations. In this particular area, there were six service stations serving that area, so there was no need for another one.

I could go on and give I think other instances where perhaps the government policy has been revoked by the Municipal Board. I have had my suspicions some time.

Let it be a good policy, a policy of restraint and good planning, which will protect the property owners in the district, for a certain period of time at least.

MR. G.B. SALSBERG.(St. Andrew): Mr. Chairman, on Vote 126: we are called upon to vote for $145,000 for the Municipal Board, and I suggest to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) that the issue which has been raised by the hon. members who has spoken before me exceeds by far the immediate problem which they brought to the attention of the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar). It is not merely a question of the action of the Board, nor a situation which was raised by the citizens of Swansea, or any part of Toronto. I think it is important only insofar as it helps to illuminate the bigger problems, which are the excessive powers of the Municipal Board, which are not in any way responsible to the elected representatives of the people. That is the problem in a nut shell.

MR. MILLARD: And the government says they will not do anything with that?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) said he would not interfere. I do not think he has any right to interfere, and if he did, I think there would be objection. And yet the Board has power to over-ride the decisions of Councils, and set aside petitions signed by hundreds of rate payers, and they are accountable to nobody after they have done what in ther opinion is right.

MR. DUNBAR: Did you ever know of the Municipal Board going into any municipality without an application being made by the Municipal Council?

MR. SALSBERG: I cannot answer that question "yes" or "no". It is not necessary for me to answer it "yes" or "no". It is not to repeat, except briefly at this stage, what the most important newspapers in the province and what

the Ontario Association of Municipalities have said, to prove that there is something radically wrong which requires correction. That is what I am pointing out. What they have done in Swansea is only one incident, and I agree that every thing is probably being done, but when the Ontario Association of Municipalities submitted to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) a petition and asked a review of the powers of the Board, with a view to ensuring the autonomy of municipal councils is not infringed upon, and to the end that the greatest possible freedom of decision is reserved to the Municipal Councils, consistent with sound financial interest, I think some attention should be paid to that.

When the Association of Municipal Councils come to the hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) at such a time, we must acknowledge there is something certainly wrong, especially so when hon. members of the Legislature find it almost impossible to question the Board here. The hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is obviously obliged to say that he does not interfere in any way with the autonomy, but, Mr. Chairman, if the Toronto Evening Telegram can write an editorial, urging the government to bring about a change in this situation, and acknowledging that the Municipal Board has too much power, then I suggest it is a serious matter and should deserve some discussion and somme immediate action on the part of the government.

(TAKE "HH" FOLLOWS)

Here is a quotation, a short paragraph, from the Toronto Telegram, editorial:

> "Where before it was possible perhaps to argue that no other governmental agency with authority to deal with municipal matters existed the creation particularly of the Department of Municipal Affairs in 1935 supports the plea of the municipalities that much of the administrative and jurisdictional powers of the municipal board are misplaced."

I think that is right. I think it would be far more democratic and of greater assurance to the municipalities if the Department of Municipal Affairs were directly responsible and answerable to the House than at present. At about the same time that the Telegram wrote this editorial the Toronto Star carried a leading article headed "Five all-powerful men have last say in annexation." Then there is a sub-heading "Elected councils say appointed Board really runs Ontario." I am not going to burden the House with reading the article, itself.

MR. DUNBAR: Please do not refer to anything which is before the municipal board at the present time.

MR. SALSBERG: I am not.

MR. DUNBAR: You are.

MR. SALSBERG: I did not read; I merely gave the headline. What is before the municipal board I hope is not as sacred as what was before the Hope Commission; because, for five years every time any one on this House got up to speak about something he was told "Now, hold it; that is before the Hope Commission; you cannot discuss that."

So, for five years -- I can think back, too -- hon. members got up to discuss questions affecting education, the Department of Education, educational policies and they were told to sit down "The Hope Commission is in session" and "Do not disturb them." Certainly the municipal board is not in that same position. We do not have to be afraid to mention the word, just the word "annexation". I have mentioned it already, anyway.

I do ask the government, Mr. Chairman, by addressing myself to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) to give this House and, through the House, to the people of the province and to the municipal government level of the province, some assurance that the excessive power of the municipal board will be curbed and that the authorities of municipal councils will not be further undermined and that, is necessary, the entire Municipal Act be rewritten. It is long overdue. I agree with those who say that the Municipal Act is an archaic piece of legislation. It does not meet the present day requirements. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) knows that.

MR. DUNBAR: No; I do not.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) knows that. I give him an opportunity at this point to reassure the people of the province and the elected governments which are closest to them, the municipal government level, that their rights and jurisdictions and authorities, will not be further undermined by the excessive powers of a board which has responsibility not to the Legislature, not to the municipalities, and I, for one, am unable to say to whom they are responsible.

MR. DUNBAR: You mentioned about curbing the powers of the municipal board.

MR. SALSBERG: Municipalities.

MR. DUNBAR: That the municipal board shall curb the powers of the municipalities.

MR. SALSBERG: Right.

MR. DUNBAR: I asked you the question first. Did you ever know of the Board going into a municipality without the application being made by the elected representative of the municipality? Therefore, how can you say that they are curbing their duties when they have been invited in there, asked in there, to settle something which they can not settle themselves? If they could settle it themselves why did they call on the Municipal Board? But, do not forget that every dollar of expense of your debentures issue in this province is the first mortgage against a man's home.

MR. SALSBERG: May I answer your question?

MR. DUNBAR: Is the first mortgage against a man's home. It does not matter if he has what he considers a first or second mortgage, if there is a sewer constructed, a local improvement made, a general tax, or water mains, or sidewalks, or anything else, that becomes, the minute the debenture is sold, the first mortgage against that man's home. Therefore that is why the municipality wants to bring the Municipal Board in, have a hearing, so that the home ownerswill have an opportunity of saying whether they are satisfied, that is, the majority of the home owners, whether that first mortgage should be placed against their homes. They require that power. I will answer your question. Am I prepared to curb the powers of the Municipal Board?

MR. SALSBERG: Do you think they should be?

MR. DUNBAR: Just a moment. You have had a nice little sing song, a bedtime story, again.

MR. SALSBERG: I read them in the newspapers.

MR. DUNBAR: Listen to me for a minute.

MR. SALSBERG: I will.

MR. DUNBAR: I will answer you. I am not going out and steal another man's platform tonight. There is a man named Walter Thomson who has said that as soon as he gets power he will curb the power of the Municipal Board. Therefore, he admits the party in power for nine years has no extra powers today than it had then. Let him go ahead and be elected on that, because I will not say we are going to.

MR. SALSBERG: The honl Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) has asked me some questions. I would like to answer him.

THE CHAIRMAN: Make it short.

MR. SALSBERG: I will try to be shorter than the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar). The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) asked me to state whether I know of any instance where the B oard went into a municipality without being invited to come in.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes; how many?

MR. SALSBERG: If the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and his entire staff could not answer simpler questions tonight how dows the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) expect me to answer without a staff?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) will be sympathetic tonight,

and be full of sympathy because he understands what difficulties one faces when one is asked questions on the spur of the moment. He will not be too demanding, I am sure. I am sure I can count on that. I sympathize with the hoh. Minister Affairs, (Mr. Dunbar) as well.

MR. DUNBAR: I am not looking for any sympathy from you.

MR. SALSBERG: And you get it, just the same, from me.

MR. DUNBAR: I have looked after myself, so far, against you.

MR. SALSBERG: You did the best you could under the circumstances, but, believe me, it was not the best.

Let me say I believe it would be far better for the House and for the Ministers -- in plural -- if, when estimates come up, their deputies are allowed to sit on the floor in front of the desk of the Minister principally involved with his estimate and that would enable him to get answers right there and without waiting for Mount Olympia to send a message in.

Having said what I have, and having softened the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) up, so I can count on his sympathy, I want to say that why I have not a statistical list ---

MR. DUNBAR: Please do not offer me your sympathy; do me a kindness.

MR. SALSBERG: I am quoting from a responsible newspaper which, when speaking with regard to the Board, says the following that "If Orillia wanted to charge a fee for licencing bicycles that would have to be cleared by the Board."

MR. DUNBAR: What?

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) asked whether they have to be invited in. They do not have to be invited in; Municipal Councils just have to trip down or up to Queens Park, depending where they are originally located. If they are south they come up and if they are north they come down. They have to have permission to put on a bicycle licence fee.

> "Further, any of Ontario's 500 odd independent telephone companies must get the Board's okay before raising rates. If the TTC wants to install a new safety device or a new type of car, it has to receive first the B oard's endorsation."

They can sit there, knowing nobody dares to do very much without coming to them for their approval.

Here are a few instances. Here is an editorial heading of the Toronto Star. It is very brief and to the point: "Curb that Board." Too bad that that title was not used for a theme song last night. It could have been put to excellent words, and I am sure the musical talent which exists in the galleries would have accompanied it excellently. "Curb that Board". It also speaks here of a decision of the London, Ontario City Council which asks for the curbing of the powers of the B oard. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the cry for somehow regulating the powers of the Board comes from all over the Province. I do not pretend to be the authority of this question but, on the other hand, I suggest that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) who is a specialist, should not dismiss it so easily. I find much of what Mr. Thomson

says rather broad, wide and open.

MR. NIXON: Wise.

MR. SALSBERG: And open to question and examination. I am not prepared to say, and I do not think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) should be, that everything Mr. Thomson says is wrong. The Telegram proposes it, the Star proposes it, the London Free Press proposes it, the Association of Municipalities of Ontario proposes it, and Mr. Thomson proposes it -- and I, also, dare to make that suggestion.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) should not dismiss it with a sweeping movement of his arms. Much as I like to see the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) in action, I do suggest that he should give the matter more attention than he obviously conveys about giving it in the House now; although I think the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) is giving it a lot of attention, I do suggest it is a Cabinet problem and I think the Cabinet should come to grips on that problem and really establish the true position of the Municipal Board, in relationship to the Municipal governments, and what the Municipal governments can look forward to in the future, if this Board is curbed, or not curbed.

MR. T.D. THOMAS (Ontario): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) in his Budget speech the other day made reference to the Ontario Municipal Improvements Corporation. During the course of his remarks he mentioned that the affairs of the corporation are conducted by three directors, etc.

MR. DUNBAR: What is that?

MR. THOMAS: The affairs of the Corporation are in the hands of three directors.

MR. DUNBAR: That is, the Improvement Corporation?

MR. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. DUNBAR: That is not in this estimate.

MR. THOMAS: It is not?

MR. DUNBAR: No.

MR. PORTER: The Treasury estimates.

MR. DUNBAR: It will be in the estimates of the Treasurer.

MR. NIXON: I was going to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the government that this session we set up a standing committee of this House to look into the different Boards and commissions of the government, that this Committee might very properly ask the Municipal Board to appear before them and give an accounting as to just why they did act as they did in this particular case which the hon. member for York, West (Mr. Millard) brought up, and also in connection with the service stations on Jarvis Street. It would seem to me that would be quite a proper forum with which to enquire into these matters rather than to ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) to get a report from the Municipal Board or lay it on the table of the House. It is just possible that the rather wide and absolute powers given to this Board may be abused by the present Board, whereas they were not abused in my day, because frankly I never remembered such a case as the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) brought up in all the years I have heard the Municipal Board discuss its actions in this House. After all, this House ---

MR. DUNBAR: It is the first time in my time of eight years, also.

MR. NIXON: This House has some responsibility for the Boards its sets up and for the powers it gives them. I, for one, will, by no means, say that in a Board created by this Legislature, of which I am a member and entrusted with certain powers, if there is any suggestion that they are abusing the powers which are given to them that they should be brought before this Committee or to some other special committee and, if they are abusing their powers, it should be made clear that possibly they are not the proper persons to enjoy such powers being given to them by this Legislature, or maybe they do enjoy too wide powers, as you say Mr. Thomson has suggested, and they may be very properly curbed.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): Another matter, Mr. Chairman, under that same vote; over a year ago there was a good deal of discussion in this Legislature and by Cabinet Ministers in the province and particularly this particular locality, regarding this whole question of amalgamation. It is now before the Board and, if I recall correctly, I think it was the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) who made the statement at one stage of the proceedings or -- the Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), I am not exactly sure which -- that something would have to be done regarding this question by January 1, 1951, "or else". I think the words were "or else".

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): That is right.

MR. MILLARD: The matter has now been before the Board. I would take it from Press reports that the Board have certainly been making a very serious and consistent effort to arrive at some decision.

I would like to point out to the hon. Minister of

Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) and to the hon. members of this House that there are quite a number of municipalities which are certainly up in the air as to whether they should proceed on their own to further the services in their area. There is a crying need in suburban municipalities particularly as to what they are going to do in a planned sort of way for industrial development and for residential and green belt reservations, and so on. These municipalities are pretty much at a stand still; they do not know what to do. In the meantime they are growing up something like Topsy in Uncle Tom's Cabin. They are just growing. There is very little planning because no one knows what the final results will be with respect to this question.

The question I want to put to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar), because it comes properly under this vote is, has the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Dunbar) any idea now about when this matter might be resolved by the Board, or is it likely not to be resolved by the Board and have to be resolved in some other way?

MR. DUNBAR: I could not give you that answer. I do not see how the Board could cut any municipality off when they have put evidence before the B oard and offer their arguments. I think when they have heard Toronto's end of it they have to hear all the municipalities. What has made it a little drawn out is the asking for adjournments. The municipalities themselves were asking for adjournments. That, of course, stretched it out somewhat. I could not give you any true facts; that would depend entirely upon the length of the brief, the arguments and the number of people appearing before the Board.

(TAKE "II" FOLLOWS)

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, let me say to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) this, that already in the press has appeared an article stating that in the summer of 1951 the city of Toronto will not be able to supply the amount of water even that their grants call for in the suburban municipalities. Now, it seems to me we are up against very technical questions here that demand some answers and we just cannot afford to keep on putting off the resolution of this problem because in the meantime municipalities must decide and practically, I say this is not of good conscience in regard to civil defence and in regard to sewage disposal and the need for water. We would be in one terrible condition in this coming year unless this matter can be resolved and we can tell what the future road holds in regard to this vital service. I know in the area that I represent we had a situation where there is a very expensive school and where the sewage system broke down and I had complaints from parents that the sewage was floating around in the school yard. Now, that is the kind of condition which just won't keep indefinitely while other municipalities ask for postponements and other municipalities take the position, "Well, we are all right we are getting along not so bad and we are not vitally concerned with the solution of this problem". Now, the question I am putting to the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) is this, how do we get the resolution of this affair, because, Mr. Chairman, this is not one of those things that can go over an indefinite period or over years like the Hope Commission did, something has to be done, to be resolved.

MR. DUNBAR: Yes, I agree that serious consequences may occur but at the same time even if I had anything to do

with the Municipal Board I would not take the responsibility of stepping out while the evidence is being heard from the different municipalities. You talk about local autonomy but when all those municipalities were created around Ottawa, before they were heard of, the government said, "We have heard enough, we are going to have agreements, we are going to manage things, it does not matter who it is". That is not the kind of treatment that the people of Ontario want, the citizens of these municipalities want --

MR. MILLARD: That is not a solution.

MR. DUNBAR: No, but they are working on it. We cannot tell when the evidence will come to an end, I do not know what can be done. Now, would you say that we should do in Toronto the same as Jimmy Douglas did with Regina last year, without any hearing at all he said, "All the suburbs are going to be in one, Regina is going to be one, going to spread out, take it and like it, the 1st of January Regina is going to spread her borders and take in all the municipalities." Without a hearing at all the government decided that. We are not going to do that.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, may I plead with the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) what is the answer to the question by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon)? Do we have some hearing where the officials of the Board can appear and where they can be questioned on some of these important matters?

MR. DUNBAR: You will have an opportunity.

MR. NIXON: That committee has not been organized yet?

MR. DUNBAR: No, but you personally will have an opportunity.

MR. R.A. McEWING (Wellington, North): Mr. Chairman, on vote 126, there are two or three items there and I think that point in regard to the matter of the Municipal Board and jurisdiction is something that is long overdue. Now, the Municipal Board has certain jurisdiction. We will take, for instance, in regard to the rural telephone situation. Probably I am treading on dangerous groupd because this issue is supposed to come before the House. When it is coming we do not know but it was mentioned in the speech from the Throne and the Session is pretty well over. But, the decisions of the Municipal Board --

MR. PORTER: It is not over yet.

MR. McEWING: No, not over yet but the decisions of the Municipal B oard regarding rural telephones is so far out of keeping with the decisions of the Transport Board and their jurisdiction that the whole thing is in a mess. I think it is long overdue that something be done regarding this matter and when the statement that their powers should be overhauled, I think it is certainly time in some directions, they have too much power and in other directions they are probably curbed through certain Acts. That is why I say it is long overdue. Now, in item No. 4, vote No. 126 it says "Drainage referees". How many referees are there?

MR. DUNBAR: One.

MR. McEWING: Is there any report?

MR. DUNBAR: McKibbon, I think at Chatham, Honeywell in Ottawa died and there has been no appointment there.

MR. McEWING: Is there any report of their decisions in recent years that have been printed?

MR. DUNBAR: Unless they are called in on the

drainage questions.

MR. McEWING: Is there any published report of their decisions on occasions on which they have been called in?

Mr. DUNBAR: No, and the drainage is all under public works. I would not know if there were any reports.

MR. McEWING: Well,then, why is it under the Department of Municipal Affairs?

MR. DUNBAR: All the drainage last year after the Committee on Conservation was appointed and made their recommendation, all drainage was placed under Public Works.

MR. McEWING: He made some decisions, did he not, the referee?

MR. DUNBAR: I do not know, not being in my Department.

MR. McEWING: If he is not in your Department why is it here?

MR. DUNBAR: The Drainage Act is under the Conservation Department.

MR. McEWING: Well, why are the referees not under the Drainage Department? Why is it under the Department of Municipal Affairs?

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Is that a revision?

MR. McEWING: Is it a full time job?

MR. DUNBAR: It was another power given to the Municipal Board that had not been asked by them.

MR. McEWING: May I ask when was the last report of the decision of the drainage referee published, can the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) answer that?

MR. DUNBAR: No, I cannot, because it just landed on my lap now.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: You have not got a very big lap either.

MR. WALTERS: Well, do you want sympathy?

MR. McEWING: Could the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) answer this, is there anything liable to be coming up regarding the report of The Conservation Committee that will set up some machinery that will deal effeciently with drainage and what have you along that line? What have you under the Conservation angle which might change the complexion of the set up of the drainage referee? Is there a Board or anything at all, is there anything being offered at this Session?

MR. DUNBAR: No, I think the report was made by the Committee that it was to be referred to the Municipal Board.

MR. McEWING: Did you put the report of that Committee into the hands of the Municipal Board?

MR. DUNBAR: No, not the Municipal Board, the Public Works.

MR. McEWING: Well, is there anything ---?

MR. DUNBAR: Recommendations on certain things go to the Municipal Board for decision ,but any other part of the Drainage Act is under Public Works.

MR. McEWING: And there are no Bills or recommendation, coming into the House resulting from the report of that Committee?

MR. DUNBAR: Nothing, not in my Department.

MR. McEWING: Would you say there are none?

MR. DUNBAR: No, I could not answer yes or no. How can I explain what the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) will do. He will be here next week, he knows what he is going to bring into this House.

MR. McEWING: You just said yours was not a one-man government. Would you not discuss this with the Cabinet Ministers if anything was to be brought into this House, if you are going to bring anything in to this House?

MR. L.E. WISMER (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, before you leave this vote, the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Thomas) asked the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) about the Municipal Improvements Corporation.

MR. DUNBAR: I gave him the answer.

MR. WISMER: The answer was, that it was covered under the Treasury, there is no item in the Treasurer's Estimates.

MR. DUNBAR: Well, of course, the 15 million dollars last year was under the Treasurer's Department. I suppose they have not required more money this year and the debentures are not paying the Civil Service, therefore, there may not be anything in the Treasury Department.

MR. WISMER: Could I ask another question? I do not think there is any chance to ask these questions at another time. It is really your Department which would recommend which debentures which would be purchased, is that true?

MR. DUNBAR: What is that?

MR. WISMER: It would be from your Department that the recommendations would be made to the Corporation for the purpose of various debentures?

MR. DUNBAR: No, no, they come to the Municipal Board. The municipalities have debentures and if they are

granted they come direct. They may not refer to our Department at all. Our officials might assist them if they want certain papers filled out, otherwise they go direct to the corporation.

MR. WISMER: It does not bother your Department at all?

MR. DUNBAR: No, not at all.

MR. H.L. WALTERS (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this Department I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Dunbar) a question. Did the members of the fourth estate get permission from the Municipal Board to use the Civil Storm Troopers that they used last night for the guard of honour?

MR. DUNBAR: I did not hear that, what did you say?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Vote No. 127 agreed to.

Hon. DANA PORTER (Minister of Education): Department of Education, page 32.

Hon. G.H. DUNBAR (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I want to say, we have finished these Estimates, and in all my Estimates over the last eight years there was something mentioned the other day which bothered me a little, I must say, when the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Wismer) said I gave a cocktail party to the Municipal Associations. The Mayors and Reeves were entertained the night after, the city of Toronto entertained them at the Scarboro Golf Club but I want to assure you there was not a cent in these Estimates and I never entertained them.

MR. W.H. TEMPLE (High Park): I am very glad to hear it, I hope others follow your example.

MR. NIXON: What is the matter with an entertainment? Perhaps we ought to pursue this further?

MR. PORTER: It sounded rather good to me.

MR. GRUMMETT: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) must have whispered when calling his Department.

MR. PORTER: No, I spoke in my usual loud voice but nobody paid the slightest attention to me. They are too much concerned with some of their own jokes.

MR. NIXON: $600,000.00 passed before we find the page.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: I thought we were going very well.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on vote 37 -- I do not know whomthe hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is trying to silence, no one said anything yet.

MR. PORTER: I want to hear you.

MR. SALSBERG: Unless he is beginning to hear voices.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: I want to get it right, what are you asking a bout?

(TAKE "JJ" FOLLOWS)

I might as well ask it now, I have been asking that question for years during the Estimates and the financial critic of the Liberal group (Mr. Brown) raised it today and perhaps this is as good an opportunity for me to raise it again this year and perhaps the government will announce policy in regard to it.

The cost of living bonus figure in this Estimate is $235,000. I suggest as briefly as I can that it is high time that the government incorporated the cost of living bonus that it is paying to the provincial civil service into the regular salary structure. It has taken place in practically all of industry. There are very few indeed in the province that still retain the cost of living bonus item. The overnment in the past has indicated that it was considering it and they were going to absorb it and include it in the regular wage structure, and I would like to hear from the government at this time whether they are prepared to put an end to this unduly prolonged, archaic system of keeping a cost of living item separate from the wages and salaries paid and are they prepared to incorporate it in the salary structure?

MR. PORTER: Well, Mr. Chairman, the point raised by the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg) of course is a question of government policy applying to all Departments.

MR. SALSBERG: Right.

MR. PORTER: And it is not merely a question that applies to this Department.

MR. SALSBERG: No.

MR. PORTER: And I am not prepared to say what possible change in government policy may occur in the future. The government policy at the moment is reflected in this cost of living bonus, that is the policy. Whether that may be changed

in the future, time only can tell.

MR. SALSBERG: In that case, Mr. Chairman, I think I am entitled to press the question in this form and ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), who is responsible for these Estimates, whether in his opinion the present system should be continued or ended. After all, you are responsible for your Department, while it is true it is general government policy.

MR. PORTER: I am perfectly satisfied with the policy of the government as it applies to all Departments and my Department. In my opinion under present circumstances it is perfectly just and fair and has proved agreeable to all those concerned.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, that is a clear enough answer.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, under item 5 of Vote 37, there is an item for $10,000, "Consolidation and revision of Acts, Regulations, etc." Under item 10 of the same vote, there is an item of $35,000 for maintenance. Under item 12, there is "Revision of courses, services, travelling expenses, etc."

Now, in regard to the entire vote number 37, I see no item for $10,000 statutory, voluntarily reduced to $8,000; do I assume that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is going to be paid through the Attorney-General's Department? Is that correct?

MR. PORTER: Well, I hope so. I hope there is an item in the Attorney-General's Department.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: Well, you might consult your colleague.

MR. PORTER: I never thought of looking for it. I hope the hon. member (Mr. Millard) will advise me as to that.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Take it up with the hon. the Attorney-General (Mr. Porter).

MR. MILLARD: Well, the point I would like tohave clear, and I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to make the explanation is that under the Royal Commission on Education Report I noticed in my reading of the Report that there is a strong recommendation for the reorganization of the Department. And there is a still stronger recommendation for a full-time Minister.

MR. PORTER: Oh, not as strong as all that.

MR. H. C. NIXON (Brant): Oh, yes, it is.

MR. PORTER: There are qualifications.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Very strong.

MR. MILLARD: I would say that the recommendation for a full-time Minister is about one of the strongest recommendations in the whole voluminous Report.

MR. NIXON: No qualification about it.

MR. PORTER: Well, apparently that is one thing in the Report that all hon. members opposite agree with thoroughly and 100%.

MR. OLIVER: You should carry it out. We made that recommendation before the Report.

MR. NIXON: That is where they got it.

MR. PORTER: We get the point, you do not need to repeat it.

MR. MILLARD: We agreed on t at point before even the Commission said it. So that I assume that by the Estimates we are to take it that there is no contemplation of a full-time Minister for the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: I would not say that at all. There is not one now, but government policy--

MR. MILLARD: Well, if there was any contemplation

of it, I imagine provision would be there for the salary. If there was going to be a change, there would probably be a change now, and I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to explain whether these 5, 10 and 12 have anything to do with the recommendation in favor of a reorganization of the Department. I would like the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to explain what is meant by "revision of courses and services," and what is meant by this $35,000 item of maintenance.

Now, I would like to get an explanation of those three points within that vote.

MR. PORTER: I get the question, yes. As to 37 (5), there is an increase there from last year to $10,000. Last year it was $5,500. This is to provide for office consolidations of the various Acts and Regulations pertaining to education and to the Department. This is partly due to the fact that the Statutes have been consolidated, the new consolidation has come out, the revision has come out and a great deal of new printing has to be done this year and the available supplies of these office consolidations has run low and there is a larger item to cover that. Also there is a greater demand for it, there has been an expansion in the school population, a larger number of people who are requiring copies of these office consolidations. Also, not only the Acts are being reprinted pertaining to the Department, but the Regulations are also being reprinted following the consolidation and revision of the Regulations. That is the explanation of that figure of $10,000.

The next item the hon. member (Mr. Millard) mentioned was number 10, maintenance. This item is raised from $20,000 to $35,000. The increase is partly due---I may say, first, that this item consolidates expenditures for freight, express, cartage, telegraph, telephone, stationery and printing, etc., which is difficult to allocate to the specific branches---that

is always done so, that is the purpose of this item. The reason for the increase is that now the postage for the branches of the Department carried on at 206 Huron Street and 244 College Street will cost approximately $5,000 and this is being paid directly by the Department. That mail does not come through the Central Post Office in the building here where the postage is paid out of the general fund, it is now separately paid that way, which had not been done before, but this was more convenient, more direct and quicker. That accounts for some of that increase. The rest is an increase resulting from certain charges that are being made that were formerly absorbed by Public Works. They are charging against the different Departments some of the equipment items that are being undertaken, such as putting up some shelving in an office. At one time that was done by the Department of Public Works and it was all paid for out of that Department. Well, now they are charging that to the different Departments, I understand--at any rate so far as I know they are doing it with this Department and that accounts for some of the increase.

Then there was another item, number 12, Provision of Courses. This is to provide for the services and expense of committees and individuals appointed torevise coursesof study and carry on research in that connection. This follows the curriculum changes, at least a great deal of this increase results from the curriculum changes that were introduced in October 1949, and it was found last year that we did not make a sufficient provision for this and therefore that is why it is increased to the extent it is. This whole procedure of revising the curriculum is quite a vast undertaking, it has involved the calling in of different groups from different parts of the province; committees have been established in different communities to work out certain aspects of the

curriculum, there is a much greater decentralization than there was before, and this item has gone up. It might look quite a substantial increase but in view of the sort of work that is being done, I do not think it is out of line.

I think that explains it.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, supplementary to the question on 5, "Consolidation and revision of Acts," I was most anxious to find out in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) reply whether or not there is contemplated the consolidation of the present educational Acts in the--

MR. PORTER: Well, I may say, Mr. Chairman, that is contemplated, but that is quite an undertaking, with some difficulties involved. There may be some changes that will have to be contemplated before we actually consolidate all these Acts into one. It is certainly not something that could be properly completed between the time we received the Hope Report and this Session.

It is not just a matter of putting all the present Acts under one cover, that in a sense can be done now. I mean these offers consolidations, we have our consolidations of certain specific Acts, there are several different ones under separate covers. It is not just a question of putting them--

MR. MILLARD: I do not mean putting them under one binding, I mean putting them into one Act.

MR. PORTER: Yes, and that involves considerable studying. There are different angles, because all these Acts touch on very complex situations which cannot be rushed. That is under contemplation.

MR. MILLARD: That is in that item?

MR. PORTER: Oh, no, that has nothing to do with this item. That is work that will be carried on in the Department.

Nothing to do with that item particularly.

Vote 37 agreed to.

MR. W. H. TEMPLE (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would like to report upon the experiment in connection with the three divisional met ods of education. Is he in a position to give us any information upon what success it is having?

MR. PORTER: Well, I can say this, that I think there are more than a hundred Boards now that have introduced in an experimental way the proposals as to the early grades. The hon. member (Mr. Temple) may recall---I do not think I have to outline in any detail the general principle behind the curriculum changes, I think the hon. member (Mr. Temple) is probably very familiar with that---but there are quite a large number of boards, more than a hundred now, I think, that have introduced these into the early grades in the schools, 1, 2 and 3. I cannot give any final opinion as to how well it is working, but the reports are very favorable, the teachers apparently on the whole are favorable to the change, t ey have found that it is an improvement, and I think the children are reacting to it very well.

(Take KK follows)

I think the children are reacting to it pretty well. I may just point out that the hon. members may have noticed in one of our Toronto papers -- The Evening Telegram -- a series of articles by Mr. Byrne, who is on the staff of the Telegram. He was apparently assigned to follow up these curriculum changes, and he did it at the different schools, and sat in the class rooms. I do not think Mr. Byrne claims to be any educationalist in the technical sense. I think he is a first-rate reporter from what I have read, because he presented it in a very clear and human way. He describes the individual classrooms where these changes have been experimented with, and he gave a very worthwhile account, and it is well worth the attention of the hon. members, to look back over these articles. He gave a much clearer idea than I can in the few minutes I have at my disposal as to how these things were done.

This covers the early grades, 1, 2 and 3.

Then, of course, the other important change is that we are attempting to introduce now the integration of the curriculum as between grades 7, 8, 9 and 10. The last two grades were elemtary school grades, and the first two grades in the secondary schools.

Our great problem has been under our educational system in this province -- we have still in many schools a very abrupt break in the work that is done in the classrooms, the curriculum, the way it is taught, the treatment of the curriculum between grade 8 and grade 9. A child would get up to grade 8, and be accustomed to a certain progression in the curriculum, a certain type of teaching and a certain approach, and all of a sudden he would be asked to write an entrance examination, where they were

still being written, although I think the entrance examinations are being done away with in a great many communities, and the pupils are permitted into the high schools on certificates, to a very large extent. But the high school entrance examination was an additional hurdle. the child was asked to jump, an additional widening of the approach between the atmosphere and the curriculum in the studies between grade 8 and grade 9.

The child would get into the high school, and suddenly would find himself in one of the new buildings, with a new staff and a new curriculum, which, in many cases, was not coordinated with the one of the year before. The result was that many children were not just able to make the grade in that first year in high school.

The great objective of our curriculum changes in these four grades is to smooth out that process. The way we are approaching that is this; we cannot do it by any central directives from Queens Park. If these changes take place effectively, a sound foundation is laid, but it cannot be done all at once, and we have to take it in our stride, and we have to get the cooperation and the whole adoption of these new suggestions by the teaching profession itself, and it is the teachers in the last two grades of the elementary schools and the first two grades of the high schools who have to work out in each community the best way of intergrading the classrooms studies, particularly between grades 8 and 9, so the child can step from public school, or from the separate schools, inti grade 9 , in the highschools, and not feel that he is in anentirely new atmosphere with respect to his classroom studies.

It will be just the same progressive move as it was from grade 6 to grade 7, or grom grade4 to grade 5.

In order to accomplish that, we have encourage the establishment of curriculum committees locally, which will consist of some of the teachers in those two grades in the upper school, and in the elementary school, and some of the members of the Board and the school inspector are generally called in to these committees, and the schools Principals, and they sit down and try to figure out what is the best way of smoothing out the classroom work in those grades.

Those are working out very well. There are more than 100 Committees of that kind which have been established, and are succeeding. The results are good, because teachers themselves and teachers' Principals have really the say as to how they will shift the work here and there. There is a greater flexibility in the sort of textbooks they use. For instance, the established system has always been to provide textbooks authorized by the Department, and nothing else could be used. Generally it was one textbook on one subject, just one authorized textbook, all over the province, and every child would be reading from that one textbook, and that one textbook only.

The situation is changed and today there are a great many textbooks on the market. There is quite a competition in the production and publication of textbooks by many eminent writers and educationalists.

Some of them come from other countries. Some of the textbooks or based on things which are produced in the old country, or in the United States. We do not any more authorize textbooks in that way at all. We simply decide upon a certain

way the textbooks will seem to fill the bill insofar as the curriculum is concerned. One might be as good as the other. Some people might think one is better than the other, but we have four or five on any one subject, and we might say that these textbooks are permitted, and any school board can judge which one they want to use, one or the other, or alternate them, or in any way they like.

We come now, as the result of the great wealth of textbook material today to the question of the effect of that on changing the curriculum. The actual fact is that the subject matter of a classroom may vary in different communities. There may be more emphasis placed on certain types of subjects which better meet the needs of the community, or the work that is being done there. There is a great decentralization in that respect.

I would say in answer to the hon. member's question (Mr. Millard) -- I apologize for being so long --

MR. SALSBERG: Very interesting.

MR. MILLARD: Go ahead, that is what we want.

MR. PORTER: It is very interesting experiment. It is not entirely novel, not as new as it might have been depicted when first announced --

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: I never like the word "revolutionary", especially when it applies to myself. This is not as revolutionary as it was thought it might be; it is something which has been tried in some aspects in other parts of the world.

MR. SALSBERG: Revolutions are always legitimate after they have taken place.

MR. PORTER: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this appears to be working very well.

I may also add to this, that last summer, at the teachers' courses which we held, there were 4,000 teachers, many more than were present the year before, chiefly because of the interest created by the new curriculum. We were very interested to find out the various implications of those who would handle it, and assume the new duties which might be placed upon them. There are many School Boards and many teachers who are a little reluctant to jump into something of this kind. We are not pressing them. We leave it to the Board and teachers themselves come forward if they want to try this, because if it goes too quickly, and too many people want it, it will be difficult for us to give the necessary guidance. They are coming forward, as a matter of fact, almost more quickly than can be handled with convenience. It is very encouraging. There will always be a disagreements about this, but, on the whole, it is working well. Of course, if it does not work well, in any particular community, they are not forced to follow any particular line. They can revert back, if they find it necessary.

MR. MILLARD: It might be possible there might be some advice given based on the experience in other places.

MR. PORTER: We do that.

MR. MILLARD: Through your Inspectors?

MR. PORTER: Our Inspectors are all instructed as to what it involves, and they do what they can to answer questions, and give the sort of guidance the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has in mind.

In one of the items about which the hon. member (Mr. Millard) asked, you will recall, there was something provided for traveling, and I think it has something to do with revising the curriculum --

MR. MILLARD: Revising the courses?

MR. PORTER: That is to cover the expenses of some of our people who go around to these places, somebody from outside.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, that was a very interesting statement which the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) made in reply to the question of the hon. member for York North (Mr. Millard). But there is one question which arose in my mind, if there is more latitude than there used to be about the course or experimental re-organization which is taking place throughout the province, does the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) think that there is any danger of children getting into difficulties because of transferring from one school to another? I am sure he will at once see what I have in mind. The population at the moment is highly mobile. There is a very high percentage of children who at one time or another move from one district to another, and I am wondering about it, and I would be glad to hear a comment from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), whether there is a possibility of some of these children being handicapped if the trend continues. That is to say, if the trend toward discretion in the courses and the technique continues in different schools. Is there any possibility that some of the children may be handicapped when they change from one school to another? I am not making a statement, but is that a difficulty which does exist? I am asking a question. Some people have complained to me

that the difficulty does exist, and of course, parents like to try to find excuses for their children, but there has been complaints made by childrens' parents, because they had to move from one school district to another, and move from one grade 7 in one school, to a grade 7 in another school.

You would expect that if a child were moving from Ontario to Quebec, but you would not expect it as much when the child moved from Guelph to Windsor, as the case may be.

(TAKE LL FOLLOWS)

MR. PORTER: I think I could answer the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) in this way: I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will agree there has always been trouble arising from mobility. No matter how uniform a curriculum may be, even though every child in the province at the same hour of the day is reading out of the same book, there is always difficulty for a child which is uprooted from one community in the middle of the term and thrown into another school in another community even though that child jumps into the same textbook and goes right on with the same chapter; but even under the old system, which I suppose is still the system in most of the schools even yet, because this will take some time to change, there is always some variation and difficulty. I do not wish to leave the impression that the injection of this flexible element into the curriculum is entirely uncontrolled. After all, any local revisions which are made have to come to the Department, they have to be approved; but, on the other hand, we want to allow as much local initiative and originality as can be put into it. Then again, on the other hand, we have to have some uniformity in the curriculum. After all, they are all working towards a certain examination at the end. Those who carry on to the final examinations are working towards that. It cannot be entirely left in a loose and independent way. I would think, as an example, take the first three grades, which, probably of all the changes is, I could call it, "more revolutionary" in relation to what has gone before than any of the other changes. A child moving from one of the schools under the old system

into one of the new grades might have a better chance, because the whole principle underlying the new type of organization is a greater independence of the child, and the child finds his own level a little bit more and is not pressed forward if he is inclined to be slow, and if he is inclined to be bright he is pressed forward about as hard as he can go. That is the principle behind it. As a matter of fact it has many similar aspects to the old one-room school in the country. One of the reasons why the one-room school was so successful as a vehicle for education was the very fact that you had several grades in one room and most of the children during the greater part of the day were on their own. The teacher could only take certain ones at a time and could not take them in all subjects at once as a class. The children had to do work on their own at there own desks. There was a great deal of inconvenience about that.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Or else, they were eavesdropping.

MR. PORTER: It might be; but they turned out to be good, sound, independent people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I agree with you.

MR. PORTER: It is a reversion, to some extent. As a matter of fact the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) would call it revolution in that sense. We are taking the best we can find out of the old one-room school system and we are trying to get it back again.

MR. SALSBERG: I would not call it reaction at all.

MR. PORTER: I am glad.

MR. SALSBERG: But I am quite willing to accept your original term that it is revolutionary.

MR. PORTER: I do not care what you call it. It is all right; it is not too bad; it is coming along all right.

I would say this in further answer to the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that I think in those early grades surely a pupil might have less difficulty in finding his feet if he got into a classroom where he was not regimented too much.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I can quite see that. But, of course, at the moment it is more likely that he would move from an experimental school to the old type than vice versa.

MR. PORTER: I do not know. We have not had enough experience to know how much difficulty might arise.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It would be worthy of some study or some observation?

MR. PORTER: It would. Of course, these things are being watched. We will be having reports on them. There are bound to be some difficulties arise with any change but we hope that it will go as smoothly as possible. That is about as much as I can say.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wonder if, at this moment, the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) would care to make a statement about the relationships of his Department with the Department of National Defence? I do not think I need to elaborate and I am sure the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) knows what I am talking about. I think the Committee would be interested in hearing a brief explanation of that particular problem and how it has been met by the Department of Education.

MR. PORTER: Well, I do not know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is referring to something which pertains to the schools, or whether ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am.

MR. PORTER: I do not know that ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am referring to the relationships of the Department of Education of Ontario with the Department of National Defence for Canada arising in particular out of the fact that married men's quarters are now maintained on a number of establishments of the Department of National Defence. Schooling has become necessary for the children. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) will be much more familiar with the story than I am. I think it is something the Committee should be told about, because it is rather important and one particular problem which has arisen notably at Barriefield camp, the school where I understand the Department of Education of Ontario has authority, so far as curriculum is concerned, -- the school is maintained by the Department of National Defence -- to which children close by do not have access, apparently on the basis that the school is supported by the Department of National Defence and not by the local taxpayers, with the result -- which I suggest is socially undesirable, whether it is avoidable or not -- that there is a segragation of the children of armory people from the children of farmers and other civilians in the same community and with the great inconvenience to the local people that children who see a school within a few hundred yards of their door are obliged to walk two or three miles to another school much further away.

The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) or his Department, has had some negotiations with Ottawa about this matter and I would appreciate hearing from him about the position of the Department.

MR. PORTER: If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) will wait a moment ---

MR. JOLLIFFE: Yes. There is no rush about it.

MR. PORTER: I have a rather general idea about this. I do not wish to be inaccurate. Perhaps I can come to this a little later.

MR. C.H. MILLARD (York, West): While the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is securing that information, I would like to revert back to vote 37, to the general proposition, and to ask three questions in connection therewith; one, I notice in my reading of the report again that it is recommended the school-attending years be lengthened by putting the official starting age at six rather than eight; and then it goes on to make certain recommendations in regard to the establishment of primary classes and the junior classes below that again. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) what is going to be done in regard to expanding the opportunity for kindergarten schooling. I would like to know if the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) can secure the information from the officials of the Department, how many elementary schools in Ontario -- that includes separate and public elementary schools -- have kindergarten classes now functioning in connection with those schools.

MR. PORTER: Do you want the number?

MR. MILLARD: I would like to know the proportion.

MR. PORTER: I have not that in front of me but I can get it.

MR. MILLARD: I just want to know the proportion, not the exact number, because it seems to me that we ought to expand this opportunity.

That brings up, the second question. I raised this in the course of my reparks during another debate. I refer to the question of these central schools with a larger school area in the elementary field. I raised the question , as the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) will recall about a certain situation which involves one of the situations to which the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) has referred to, where there is an Air Force camp and where there is a partially suburban area and partially a rural area. They are now having growing pains. They have to replace some of the one-room schools which are over-crowded and there were certain elements in that township which wanted to put in a central school. They came down to Toronto to the Department of Education and got their plans approved to go ahead on that basis. Then there was a local election, those in opposition happened to win the Board and the Council of that township and then they came down with plans and the Board not only threw out the plans they had formerly approved but then approved the establishment and the building of small schools. It was then, of course, on a vote, a referendum of the tax payers, or the ratepayers of the township. The question I want to put to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is what policy is the Department of Education going to follow to encourage these elements within these township areas who want to get the policy of the central or the larger school units established to assist them? In this case of which I am speaking, my information leads me to believe that the Department is paying 45% of the approved costs in that particular township area. Here they are going to go ahead and build new two-room schools spread out over the township rather than going in for the transportation system and bringing them in towards the central area. In that

connection I want to correct a statement -- and I direct this to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) -- which I made in my previous remarks on this question, because I indicated that the inspector in this case had barely lifted a finger, he had been very cautious -- I think the words I used -- in promoting this idea. I want to correct that statement because I do find that the Inspector attended a meeting of the citizens and stated very frankly and fearlessly that was the policy of the Department and he knew the Department would like to see it carried out. However, they came down and got the approval of the smaller schools after the original plans and they have gone ahead on that basis and it is going to be more and more difficult to change over to the other policy.

The last point I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) if he will try to answer these questions, is that on this question of curriculum change which was announced by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) in the memorandum which revised the curriculum December 10, 1949, with considerable fanfare and we were told --

MR. PORTER: No fanfare.

MR. MILLARD: Oh, there was considerable fanfare.

MR. PORTER: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member for York, West (Mr. Millard) but let me just clarify what happened. If the hon. member for York, West (Mr. Millard) wants to ask questions I will give him the answers but if he is going to talk about fanfare I am the last person in the world who would be guilty of creating fanfare. What happened was this. The curriculum changes were decided upon. I thought that ---

MR. MILLARD: By whom?

MR. PORTER: I thought a matter of this importance was something the public would like to know about. I am sure the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) would have been the first to have criticized me if I had kept this locked up in my breast and kept it secret and all of a sudden somebody awaked one morning and found ---

MR. MILLARD: Who decided on the changes?

MR. PORTER: The Department. The Department and the government has the authority.

MR. MILLARD: Who is the Department?

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is the head of the Department.

MR. PORTER: Yes; the Minister decided. The Department with the Minister decided on the changes and they were approved, and we proceeded with them. That is our responsibility. That is done under the Act. That is what we have to do. It is the responsibility of the Department of Education to deal in matters of curriculum. At any rate, all I did was to invite down to a nice place in this province--

MR. MILLARD: St. Thomas.

MR. PORTER: ---and there was a meeting of the Elgin County School Teachers. They have an Association. I thought perhaps it would be of interest to them to know about some of the technical changes in curriculum.

(TAKE "MM" FOLLOWS)

I had a speech prepared, some people might think it was all right, some people might think it was a pretty poor speech, but, nevertheless, it was a speech.

MR. SALSBERG: With extra copies of the speech?

MR. PORTER: I always have extra copies of my speeches but generally the newspapers will not pay any attention to them.

MR. SALSBERG: This time they grabbed it?

MR. PORTER: I followed the usual procedure, I had a few copies of copious notes, and I sent a few copies to the Press Gallery -- generally they throw them in the wastebasket and that is where I thought it was, it was a lot of dry technicalities that would interest no one, but I found it interested the teachers on Elgin County and they asked me if I minded if it went over the radio. They had a local station they had started a couple of years ago and they were anxious to have business, keep the station going and besides, there might have been a few people listening. I gave them this speech and it went over the radio. I do not know whether they liked it or not, they were very kind and the next morning I found that a revolution had taken place.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Now, I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, that it never entered my head that anybody would ever lift a finger as a result of a few technical changes in the school and the Hope Report came out and they agreed with the things.

MR. OLIVER: You guessed right.

MR. PORTER: I can tell you what happened and no doubt this is why they agreed. During the course of the sittings of the Hope Commission as the hon. members know, a great many briefs were presented to the Commission from time to time, especially in the early stages and the Hope Commission drew upon every possible source of information throughout the country that they could to get information about all aspects of education. Well, naturally when they came to the question of curriculum one of the sources was the Department of Education.

MR. MILLARD: There was a Committee established, was there not?

MR. PORTER: Well, there was a curriculum, there were certain officials of the Department who were charged with the responsibility of working on curriculum. I never heard of any particular Committee in that respect but there were heads of different branches who devoted their time to curriculum matters. That has been there for a long time. However, these people were asked to give their information to the Commission as to what they thought about curriculum, they wanted the departmental view as well as everybody's else view with respect to curriculum. There were really no other views, I mean, there was neally no difference of opinion about the changes required. The views presented to the Commission, the principles presented were all open to the public, there were public hearings, there was nothing secret about that. There really was not anything presented to the Commission at variance in any major way. At any rate, they were the views of the members of the

Department. Well, that happened about three years before, 1949, and hon. members will recall a statement I read in this House last year to remind the hon. members but as usual they never really listen to the really good stuff.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh yes, they do, oh yes, they do.

MR. PORTER: It was in 1949 we expected this Hope Report. This is old stuff now. We expected it but I put myself on record in this House to this effect, that they were certain changes in the curriculum that we were bringing in in the Department that we thought should be introduced as soon as possible, but in view of the fact that we thought undoubtedly that the Report would be out by June of 1949 we were certainly not going to drag this in immediately because we wanted to see what else they might have to offer. But when June 1949 came along and I was advised that the Report was not ready, and might not be ready for several months, and nothing definite was promised I decided that we had to do something because we thought it was the right thing to do. The public required the best we could offer and we knew perfectly well that the Hope Commission in regard to curriculum matters, had the opinions of our own Department freely put before them without reservations and really they had nothing that would likely be at variance with that. There was only one obvious result as to curriculum matters. At any rate, we thought it was right. That is what they adopted just as we had adopted it and it is right. There really is no other sound approach to this. I am sorry to have to go on like this but the hon. member (Mr. Millard) asked me.

MR. MILLARD: I am very glad the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is in such a mellow mood tonight and is anxious to discuss the questions because, frankly, it is a departure from the previous moods that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) had in regard to these questions.

MR. SALSBERG: Just another revolution.

MR. PORTER: Do not disturb it.

MR. MILLARD:

Last year when we were discussing similar questions, I understood him to say when he announced the changes that he had had no contacts with the Royal Commission at all.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: And I must say one of the biggest kicks I got from reading the Royal Commission Report was in Chapter 4, under the heading "Pupils Growth and Progress". It seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, that that probably constituted one of the most important jobs of that whole Report, the question of the pupils growth and progress.

It deals with this question of curriculum and here at the bottom of that chaper, on the first page, is this very significant note:

> " This and the following chapter were prepared prior to the publication on December 10, 1949, of a 'Memorandum re Revision of Curriculum' by the Minister of Education; any ressemblance between our proposals and the changes announced by the Minister is, therefore, coincidental."

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD:

"Any ressemblance between our proposals and the changes announced by the Minister is, therefore, co-incidental".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: Well, that is one of the strangest things I have ever read.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SALSBERG: It shows that life is stranger than fiction.

MR. PORTER: I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Millard). It sounds at first blush to be peculiar.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: But, nevertheless, there are lots of peculiar coincidences that happen in this world. The explanation is that in giving it, that we were acting on the same advice. The advice I was acting on they accepted that as being the best that they could get.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Great minds think alike.

MR. PORTER: As a matter of fact, they were the same minds, it was the departmental chiefs who worked this out and the Commission had the advantage of that and they thought well of it. I had the advantage of it, when I asked for any information on the Department I am entitled to have it, if that is their advice I am entitled to it. I must say, I was not in any position to offer an alternative out of my own head but, nevertheless, it looked good to me and I think it looks good now. I think seriously that this is a matter of great importance and I think all hon.

members will agree that in the main, in principle, these changes are in the right direction.

MR. MILLARD: I agree with that.

MR. PORTER: I am glad to hear that, this is not a political matter. I have interrupted the hon. member (Mr. Millard) again, I forget your questions.

MR. MILLARD: The other two questions, Mr. Chairman, were in regard to kindergardens and in regard to larger school units or the central school idea and the school age starting at 6 rather than 8 and so on.

MR. PORTER: Well now, the kindergardens, I think the figures just given to me, the total number of elementary schools in the province of Ontario is 6824, the number of schools conducting kindegarden classes are 473. Under the present policy --

MR. MILLARD: What was the first figure?

MR. PORTER: 6824 elementary schools in this province. Under the present policy to establish a kindergarden is a local decision, it is not a general policy.

MR. MILLARD: Before the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) leaves that, at the present time it is recommended in the Report that they get the hon. Minister's (Mr. Porter) permission? Is that required now?

MR. PORTER: Before it is counted as an approved cost it requires permission, yes, but naturally we are in favour of kindeegardens, they serve a very useful purpose.

MR. MILLARD: Why should it be necessary to get permission?

MR. PORTER: So we are sure it is conducted according to our policy. After all, the kindergarden does not submit to the same sort of curriculum. As long as it is operated reasonably well it is all right with us. After all, we are faced with this today, a very rapidly extending school population. Many schools have over-crowded buildings, and in many cases new buildings are desperately needed by pupils of the present legal school age and sometimes it is attempted to extend kindergardens too quickly. That would require more teachers also. Now, we are favourably disposed towards extension of kindergardens' training, but we cannot endorse it on the full system at the present time.

Now, the hon. member (Mr. Millard) mentioned the schools in some of these military camps. I am sorry, it was the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) who mentioned that. Several School Board have been set up for this specific purpose, that is in agreement with the Department of National Defence. There is one, for instance, at Petawawa. The Minister appoints the Board to operate the school.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Minister?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Which one?

MR. PORTER: Do I do that?

MR. MILLARD: Maybe it is the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Porter) who says that.

MR. PORTER: We paid 50% of the cost and the Department of National Defence paid the other 50%. That is the financial arrangement for these special schools.

(TAKE NN FOLLOWS)

I fully agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that a school of that kind that is devoted to children who just happen to be children of Army people who were stationed there at that time is not as good as having a school that is rooted in a community. On the other hand, this is an emergency situation with many problems that arise there and the local school boards and the local schools really cannot handle the problem unless we make special arrangements. It is about the best thing we can do under the circumstances.

Now, if the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is interested, I have this information. At Camp Borden, Petawawa, Barriefield, Trenton, Clinton and several other stations maintained by the Department of National Defence, schools for children of service personnel have been established. Boards of trustees are recommended by the local Army or Air Force officers, they are recommended by them and appointed by the Minister of---myself.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Well, I want to make sure of that, because I cannot take on another portfolio tonight.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: 50% of the maintenance cost is paid by this Department and 50% by the Department of National Defence. The Board of Trustees appoints the teachers and manages the schools. The segregation arises because the local residents near the station do not wish to pay for schooling of children of the forces--and you can understand that. At Camp Borden, for instance, there are over 18 rooms. The officials of the Department of National Defence have been most cooperative and most appreciated.

Well, that is the situation!

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I understand it

there are two rather serious problems that arise in this connection--at least two problems. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) will perhaps be able to tell me if I am wrong, but here is the first problem, that these stations are permanent stations. Now, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is under the impression this arises out of an emergency situation, or is a temporary thing, he misunderstands the problem. It is not temporary, it is not an emergency situation, it is permanent. These are permanent defence establishments.

MR. PORTER: That is right, but on the other hand they have a fluctuating population.

MR. PORTER: Oh, qui e, they have a fluctuating population, but nevrtheless so far as the married quarters and the family men are concerned, I think you can expect a certain amount of stability. The Army and Air Force are going to have qui e a lot of people, married men too, on strength for quite a long time. Now because these men are Army or Air Force men, it follows that almost inevitably they are going to be moved around the country from time to time. Army or Air Force men will almost certainly be moved at any moment fron Ontario to Quebec and perhaps to Nova Scotia and then perhaps to British Columbia, and according to my information it was suggested at one stage that these schools should have their own curriculum so that a child moved from Camp Borden to Camp Shilo or some other place, or perhaps down to Nova Scotia, would not be called upon to make a difficult adjustment. As I understand that proposal, namely the proposalthat they should have a commo curriculum more or less chairmaned by the Department of National Defence was rejected, they have a provincial curriculum. That is, at Camp Borden, Petawawa

and Barriefield the curriculum is the Ontario curriculum, although almost all of the children are almost certainly ordained to go to some other province before they get very much further with their schooling. That is the first problem.

The other problem, Mr. Chairman, is quite different, and that is that although the schools are provincial schools, in the sense that the Provincial Treasury is contributing 50% of the cost, they are segregated schools and I cannot accept the statement that local children cannot go to these schools because their parents do not wish them to. That is quite contrary to some of the protests which have reached me. They cannot go to the schools because they are National Defence schools and the Army does not want them there and does not see any reason why they should be there.

Now I am not saying that either of these problems can be solved easily, I am just wondering if some compromise could not be worked out whereby the children of these permanent force men would not grow up in a segregated sort of way and whereby the difficulties that attend their removal from one province to another could be minimized. It may be that you cannot solve both problems, but I am not entirely satisfied with what I have heard about the results of a place like Barriefield where I understand some children have to go two or three miles to school although they are right next door to the National Defence school.

MR. PORTER: Like Walter Thompson.

MR. JOLLIFFE: A school to which we contribute 50% of the cost.

MR. PORTER: Like Walter Thompson, who used to walk seven miles every day, and still wants the kiddies to walk that far.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Well, he has many miles further still to go.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: However, this discussion, Mr. Chairman, is becoming very non-political.

MR. F. R. OLIVER (Grey South): Better keep it that way.

MR. PORTER: I may say to the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) that no suggestion has been made to us up to date along the lines---about the curriculum. That has not come to us, strangely enough. But it is something that is well worth while---I think the whole problem should be looked into further. I will be very glad to see if we can explore all the angles of it. I can appreciate very well some special problems which may hot be easy to solve but might be eased to some considerable extent.

There is another question the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) asked. He raised the point of the school areas. I think the area the hon. member (Mr. Millard) mentioned was a public school area.

MR. MILLARD: That is right.

MR. PORTER: That is right, not a high school area.

MR. MILLARD: No, a public school---a township area.

MR. PORTER: Yea, a township area with a public school. Well, it is quite true that the Department generally has this view as to the larger school unit; as to the secondary schools, the Department is convinced that secondary school eduation according to present demands and taking into consideration what can be accomplished in seconrary education, icannot be done if you have two small a unit. I mentioned that before this Session, so I will not go into details, but that is their view very definitely about seconrdary school units in

the rural areas. Well now, regarding elementary school units; they also feel that there is a lot to be said for a large township area.

MR. MILLARD: A central school.

MR. PORTER: A central school. There are advantages. On the other hand, there are many people who do not agree entirely with that, at least they have not got to that point yet. The position I have always taken in the Department is this: A few years ago I think they adopted a much more aggressive policy of promoting high school districts in towns and township school areas, perhaps than they are doong now. I found they were running into some difficulties as a result of that policy, because although theoretically and in prinpiple the large unit can offer more in many respects, there are many practical considerations about these things and especially in the rural areas there are many difficulties that while it is all very well to talk about so many miles and so many buses and all the rest of it, it all epends on what sort of country it is. It is much more difficult in hilly country and in the snow belts---I never knew there were so many snow belts in this province until I got a knowledge of the rural life we are living in now. But are there great variations in physical conditions of topography in the country, and it is all very well to say to certain people who live in a certain area: "Now, it would be a good thing for you to have a township school." Nevertheless they may not think so, and they may be right, and my policy is, do not force them, let them decide, and as long as the decision is a local one and as long as they are convinced it is what they want and what they need and are prepared to submit to--you see, there is a great deal of resistance on the part of many parents as to sending the very young children in the early grades of the elementary schools

for several miles in a bus in the morning. They do not know, something might happen, the bus -- you often read in the newspaper about a bus being snowbound and of course that is something that might be a disaster for some of those school children. Well, the parents are concerned about those things and are a little bit afraid in some cases to have the school too far away. They would rather have a smaller unit with its disadvantages that is close by than to have a more grandiose unit which might provide in some ways a little better education, but perhaps not so much in the elementary. The elementary does not need to be graded in the same way as the secondary schools, and there is a difference of opinion--and an honest difference of opinion--as to those things.

It is true the particular matter that the hon. member (Mr. Millard) was in a more settled community. It might have been a more obvious case for the large unit, but even so, those people decided themselves as to what they wanted, and our instructor, as the hon. member (Mr. Millard) so properly pointed out, apparently advised them to the best of his ability. That is what we consider the function of our inspectors to advise when asked to do so, rather than to push people into things they might not be ready to accept, but to give the best possible advice they can. Well, those people apparently voted the other way. That is happening in many places, they have votes, they have meetings of municipal councils, they have very grave difficulties in deciding some of these problems, which, to the people in those districts, are very major problems. It touches the homes and the lives and the outlook of those people, and you cannot just say: "This thing looks good to us on paper and we think it is good, we think it is better and you have got to take it because you have got to

have something better than you want." I do not think that would do. And we try to do the best we can to iron out many of the difficulties that arise. There are many hon. members of this House that I can see here who have had those difficulties and I can assure them we have tried our best to iron them out and tried to bring the local contending parties together, sometimes without much success.

But this is what generally happens. In a high school district in the country you have a great controversy as to where the school is to go, here or here or here. Now it is generally almost necessary that the school should go into some settled community and not be right out in the country in a field. After all, the school needs to have an access to water, and some of the municipal facilities, and if the school is in a village or a town, then a great many of the pupils are righg there and there is no expense in transporting them to schools. But the question is which town, which village, and that is a question which causes a great deal of difficulty.

They contest this matter and eventually, by votes and by consideration by the municipal councils and the county councils a decision is made. It may be over the dead bodies of some people, and it may be very much to the advantage of some people, nevertheless the decision is made, the school is built and the problem is completely forgotten. They see the school, they see that the children are getting something a little better than they could otherwise. They become accustomed to the transportation--and I am speaking particularly of the secondary school pupils. After all, they are older children, and the parents are not so much worried about them, and they forget their differences and they become proud of what they have done, even though it might not be too close to the homestead.

That is what is hap eniug, but if we took any other course and attempted to dominate the situation and dictate where the school was to go and how the thing was to be done, and where the boundary line was o be drawn, no matter how good a job we do, no matter how we could defend it, in all the books or reports in the world, nevertheless the people would never be satisfied.

The people have to make these decisions themselves, and I find in the experience I have had the last couple of years that in these problems they generally come to pretty sound decisions, sometimes much better decisions than the Department might have. Very often they come to the same decision. It is like the Hope Report did wit the recommendations.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to belabor the point. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has been very fully in his explanation but it seems to me that something ought to be said regarding the transportation problem, because certainly I think parents would feel much happier to have their children picked up at the gate and taken to the school--small children, I am referring to --- than to have them walk a mile and a half or two miles with all the hazards on the highways and the roads today.

MR. PORTER: That is up to them to decide.

MR. MILLARD: So that is not a very valid answer for some of those people who make that excuse.

(Take OO follows)

And the other reply regarding the high school area: "When the people see the school building in operation, and realize that their children are having a better opportunity because of the larger school unit, they are well satisfied".

MR. PORTER: Generally.

MR. MILLARD: Yes, and I suggest the same wouldgenerally apply in connection with the elementary schools.

MR. PORTER: I think it applies in the case of high schools, because the people have decided that themselves. It is the . If it was a case of our coming to them and say: "You have to do this", the psychology, would be all wrong.

MR. MILLARD: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would go to the town of Etobicoke, which is partly rural and partly urban, I agree -- he will see that the Department did step in there, and refused to go on with a "higgedly-piggedly" establishment of schools until the 12 school sections could get together, that there were not prepared to keep on building schools "hit and miss", all over. You did apply financial sanctions to bring about a unified board in that town. I do not think that was wrong. I think it worked to everybody's advantage.

MR. PORTER: As a matter of fact, we did not do quite what the hon. member (Mr. Millard) suggest. We advised, and it was a local decision.

MR. MILLARD: Very strong advice.

MR. PORTER: I know, but sometimes we give very strong advice. There are some places where you can give stronger advice than in others.

MR. DENNISON: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) indicated that approximately 100 school sections --

was that an experiment.

MR. PORTER: It was 100 municipalities; not 100 school sections. For instance, in the city of Toronto, they are experimenting in a number of schools.

MR. DENNISON: Of these 100, I wonder if you could tell the hon. members here if they were the Public School Boards, or are some of them separate School Boards?

MR. PORTER: Some of them are separate.

MR. DENNISON; How do you manage the contentious question as to where the religious teaching stops?

MR. PORTER: There is no contention at all. The separate schools in this province go up to grade 8, as a rule. In some they may go up to grade 10. In some cases they are sort of a continuation school. In Ottawa and Windsor they go up to the 10th grade. That has been established and recognized for many years.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, would this be the time for me to bring up the matter of the radio broadcast?

MR. PORTER: Yes, if you care to. I have not a copy of it. As a matter of fact, there is no copy in the Department, because, if it is the one I think the hon. member (Mr. Jolliffe) is referring to --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Of this morning.

MR. PORTER: It was written by an employee of the C.B.C., and not prepared in the Department at all. However, I have not a copy.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is very interesting. These broadcasts -- some of which I have heard, and some of which I must say are really excellent; I have heard several sometime before the Session opened, and I was very proud

to hear broadcasts about current affairs, and they are expressly stated to be broadcasts made by the C.B.C. and the Department of Education, in collaboration.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am referring to the broadcast this morning, which I did not hear, but of which I have heard some very glowing reports indeed. When I asked the C.B.C. for a copy of the text, they said it was the property of the Department of Education. Now, am I to understand from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that the property of the Depar tment is not within the custody of the Department?

MR. PORTER: It is not in the custody of the Department. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) wants me to explain something about this broadcast --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I wish you would. It is remarkable the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) did not have the opportunity of reading it.

MR. PORTER: I did not know about it until you mentioned it at 6 o'clock.

I did not hear t , but the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Welsh) heard it, and approved of it. The information I got from the Department, when I asked them about this tonight was that very likely a copy could be obtained tomorrow, but it is down at the C. B.C., and the man in charge there is not in his office tonight. Fortunately, they got him on the telephone.

The Department of Education, in collaboration with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, presented a series of school radio broadcasts. If the hon. Leader

of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) is interested, I will send him over this list, and show what we have here. It covers all sort of things, books, and adventure --

AN hon. MEMBER: And India.

MR. PORTER: History, and science, and travel --

MR. JOLLIFFE: Good stuff.

MR. PORTER: I think it is good stuff -- with some reservations. They have current events broadcasts for grades 6 and 8, which are broadcasted every Thursday morning from 10 to 10:15, and are part of the school broadcast program, provided chiefly by the C.B.C. and the Department. They have apparently had a series of what they referred to as "Important Persons".

MR. JOLLIFFE: V.I.P.

MR. PORTER: Yes , "Very Important Persons". They had one on Mr. Saint-Laurent, one on the hon. Lester Pearson, and General Eisenhower, and Robert Menzies, the Prime Minister of Australia, and I am told they actually had one on "Joe" Stalin one day. Apparently they get requests in from different schools, that they would like to hear a talk about so-and-so. It is sort of a little fan mail of some kind, and Mr. Dobson, who is in charge of the school broadcasts for the C.B.C., up until 2 years ago was a teacher in a Toronto school. He prepares these broadcasts, and they are reviewed by Mr. Holmes, the Editor-in-chief, of textbooks of the Department.

The broadcast the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) was referring to, was a broadcast about non other than our own Premier, the hon. Leslie M. Frost.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: Together with other celebrities, apparently there was a very insistent demand from the school bildrens of this province to hear about this great man "Old Man Ontario".

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PORTER: And Mr. Dobson, who had been very broadminded up to that time, continued to be broadminded, in spite of the fact that he had been favoring the Liberal Party up to that point. Apparently there was no request for any hon. member of the Opposition, except "Joe" Stalin.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: So he prepared apparently a very fine, short, snappy dissertation upon the Premier, the hon. Leslie M. Frost, which went very well.

The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) never knew about this until tonight, that is, that he was the subject of a broadcast this morning which was being criticized very severely, because it was put on the air by the Department of Education.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, not at all. We are seeking information.

MR. PORTER: I thought it was an attack. I was really stricken. When the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) mentioned this, just as we rose at 6 o'clock, I immediately got in touch --

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) wants an attack, I will be only too pleased to oblige, but all in due time.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, the first I heard of this was in a conversation with the hon. member for Bellwoods (Mr. MacLeod) just outside the door. I never heard of it before.

MR. DENNISON: Not arranging another appearance of "Joe" Stalin , I hope.

MR. PORTER: To wind up my part of the debate; Mr. Dobson apparently tries to give information about public affairs and current events, and the purpose of the broadcast was to acquaint the children with the meaning of the term "budget".

MR. JOLLIFFE: What does it mean?

MR. PORTER: I don't know. I did not hear the broadcast.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: And with some ideas about the taxes, and the responsibility of government at its three levels, Federal, Provincial and Municipal, and certain outstanding features of the Budget were, of course, were mentioned, and among the items mentioned were "Health grants" and "The provision of free textbooks".

What could be more innocent? That is the story. I regret that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) --

MR. FROST: Has the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) a copy of the broadcast?

MR. PORTER: We could not get it. It is down at the C.B.C.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The curious thing about this broadcast is that nobody can find it. The C.B.C. says it is the property of the Department of Education, and the

Department of Education say they have not a copy. I think every hon. member of the House should be provided with a copy of the broadcast.

It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that if, as the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) suggests, the use of a broadcast in 15 minutes to instruct the children of the province about the taxing powers at the three levels of government in Ontario, they are attempting to do something if 15 minutes which some hon. members of this House have not been able to grasp, in a much longer time.

MR. PORTER: It might be a good thing to have in this House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Arising out of this broadcast, which was in part paid for by the taxpayers of this province, may I ask, if it is only educational, if it is correct, as was alledged, that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) attends a Church in Lindsay every Sunday.

MR. FROST: That is not what my Minister says.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) says that is not correct, it only goes to show what misleading propaganda was contained in the broadcast this morning.

MR. FROST: May I refer you to my minister. You might ask him. He might let me off.

MR. JOLLIFFE: He did not make the broadcast. That was made by the Department of Education and the C.B.C. and it is very pleasant for this group to find the C.B.C. interested in the Conservative Party. Usually the only Party ih which the C.B.C. is interested is in connection with the propagandists of the Party in power. Would the

hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) undertake to get a copy of the broadcast? If it was good enough for our children, it should be good enough for us.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

(TAKE "PP" FOLLOWS)

But, in any event, Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) be good enough to undertake the provide the House with a copy of the broadcast?

MR. PORTER: Yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: If it was good enough for our children it is good enough for us.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman, I happened to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe), just before we rose, serve notice that this matter would be raised. I think that was a very fair thing for the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) to do.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I try to be fair.

MR. MacLEOD: So the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) would not be caught off guard.

MR. PORTER: But, it spoiled my supper.

MR. MacLEOD: It seems rather extraordinary that the Department of Education could collaborate in the preparation of a text with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) as the subject and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) know nothing about it, because, from what the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) said, it did go into a rather detailed description of the personal habits of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), and who better than the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) could inform?

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, this is the first I ever heard of this.

MR. MILLARD: Another revolution.

MR. FROST: I will agree to do this: before the Orders of the Day I will get the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) to read it, tomorrow afternoon.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. G. B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Speaker, in respect to those broadcasts, I did not hear the broadcast today about the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and I regret that very much. One morning I got up late at about ten o'clock. I heard one of these broadcasts over one of the Toronto broadcasting stations. The thought occurred to me, are all the schools in the province of Ontario equipped with radio or how do these children get these broadcasts at ten o'clock in the morning?

MR. PORTER: There are a great many schools equipped with radio today. Most of the new schools have it and a great many of the older schools have installed radio and sort of an address system which goes into all the classrooms. It is a little more than merely radio; it enables the principal to speak from his office to any classroom he wishes. He can speak through this address system. They can also put radio programs over that system. That is why this educational program was originally designed. This is the first time after all these years that this program has been carried on that anything of this kind has happened, that our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should have been selected as the man of the day --

MR. NALEY: Why should he not be?

MR. FROST: I hope all the kids were listening.

MR. JOLLIFFE: It was not our own hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), not only his attendance at church at Lindsay on Sunday morning, it was our own hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and his Budget, and such vote-catching matters, --

MR. PORTER: You did not hear it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I may not have heard it but I know a vote-catcher when I hear one.

MR. MacLEOD: Perhaps it would be better, more desirable, if, instead of the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) reading it tomorrow afternoon, we arrange with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to have a re-broadcast into the Chamber, and we will be able to get the full effect, intact.

MR. G. E. PARK (Dovercourt): Mr. Chairman, before this passes,-- and I do not wish to deal with the question of this morning's broadcast -- there has been some question of this morning's broadcast, in other words, some criticism of the broadcast. I have heard many of them and I have observed my own children listening to them in the home. They are excellent broadcasts. The Departmental officials who arrange them, with the possible exception of this morning's broadcast, do a very good job and are to be congratulated on the job they are doing. I do not know whether it was the C.B.C. or the Department of Education which went off the rails this morning.

MR. MacLEOD: How do we know they went off the rails? It may not have been as bad as we think.

MR. SALSBERG: After all, elections do not come every day. Do not make a fuss about it.

MR.PARK: Mr. Chairman, while we will all be interested to hear the exact details of the broadcast, and the exact details of the Budget as it was described to the school children, when the script is available to us, I think with that question aside, the general level of the broadcast is excellent and the department is to be highly commended for

carrying the broadcast on.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. JOLLIFFE: To avoid misunderstanding, may I say that I agree entirely with the hon. member for Dovercourt (Mr. Park). I would repeat that I have heard some of the previous broadcasts. I thought they were excellent. Let me illustrate, Two of them, at least, were about India. It was the High Commissioner for India who was taking part in the program. Some of the hon. members may have heard that particular series. I thought it was excellent. What pleased me so much about it was here was a deliberate and very well thought out attempt to make India, a new Dominion in the British Commonwealth, a real and understandable thing to the children in our schools. I was immensely pleased with that broadcast. The High Commissioner from our sister Dominion did a marvelous job, in impeccable English, which sounded as though it was extemporaneous. He answered the questions in a way which was clear, interesting, and I would say solidly educated. Secondly, again to avoid misunderstanding, may I say again that I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) of the province of Ontario is necessarily an improper subject for such a broadcast; I mean if we are to consider what is the appropriate subject matter for educational broadcasts, I would say that occasionally a prime minister of this province might be appropriate subject matter; but, when that happens, naturally the script must be done with discretion and with care.

MR. SALSBERG: It evidently was.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We can see whether that was the case in this instance.

Vote 39 agreed to.

THE CHAIRMAN: Vote 40.

MR. DENNISON: Just a minute.

MR. NIXON: We were on Vote 37. Are we on Vote 38 now?

I notice in item 7 of vote 38, "Inspection of Indian Schools, Services, and Travelling Expenses, $2,500." That is a large increase from last year of $2,300. I was wondering if this $200. increase represented the interests of the government in the Indians about which the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) was talking the other day. If this is what the hon. Prime Minister(Mr. Frost) had in mind, when he was going to improve their lot and remove the discrimination which has existed against them --

MR. PORTER: Perhaps I had better answer one question at a time.

I will hear what the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) has to say. It may cover both.

MR. CALDER: Perhaps some of the hon. members for Toronto could give me the figures. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that in item 5 of vote 38 there are public school inspectors, in the province, being paid at a rate less than that of the elementary school principals whose schools they inspect. Does the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) not think that that is an undesirable situation; and, if he does, what steps should be taken to increase the salaries of the elementary school inspectors?

MR. DENNISON: I would like to get back to the Indian question, again. Before the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) answers the first question with respect to

Indians, I would like to ask this question. I had occasion in the early summer of 1949 to visit an Indian settlement on Manitoulin Island, a settlement of the Ojibway Indians. I was very, very much impressed with the young fellows there who were back as veterans of the second world war and who had received their schooling in the local Indian school. They had received then a certain amount of experience and knowledge because of their experiences overseas and in the army. They may have received certain education in the army as well. These veterans had this to say about the local Indian school at the west end of Manitoulin Island. They said that the teachers are always English teachers. The school, I believe, is a church school. I am not too sure which church. I think it is the Catholic Church. They said the teachers are usually English teachers, but at one time they had real Indian teachers and they wanted to impress upon me the fact that the Indian teachers did a much better job of teaching them. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter), has the Department of Education ever investigated the possibility of having more real Indian teachers trained to teach these Indian children in the Indian centres?

MR. A. MACKENZIE (York North): Mr. Chairman, I might say that I have an Indian reserve in my riding. I have been up there and they have an English-speaking teacher. He just fits in perfectly.

MR. MILLARD: Has the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) been elevated to the --

MR. MACKENZIE: Peerage?

Yes; a knight.

I mean to say, I would not get so excited over

that. I do know in my own riding, on that Indian reserve where the Indian teacher and his wife are doing a wonderful job amongst the Indians, that they really love them, and they get along as they should.

MR. DENNISON: Is that a real Indian teacher, not just an Indian teaching the Indians? Is that an Indian teacher?

MR. NIXON: Like the hon. member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie), I have a very large and a very fine group of Indians living in my riding. I am really interested in what inspection the department carries on.

MR. PORTER: I thought I would try a new procedure and collect the questions.

MR. FOSTER: I may say that I, too, have two Indian reserved in my riding. We have the privilege of having an Indian girl, who was educated in our normal school, teaching in the white district.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE: I would like to say this; again. These Indians are grand people. They are just grand people.

MR. MILLARD: Is this the next Minister of Education?

MR. PORTER: If that is the page of questions, I will see what I can do to answer them.

Mr. Chairman, the Indian schools are operated by the Department of Indian Affairs, the federal department of Indian Affairs and by agreement with the Department of Education we have inspectors to inspect those schools. There is some financial arrangement as between the governments to cover that. As to Indian teachers, of course we cannot very well control that situation because that is something

which is dealt with by the Department of Indian Affairs. They operate the schools and we merely inspect them under arrangement.

The hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) has brought up the question of the salaries of elementary school inspectors. In the first place, I may say that all these salaries are now in the course of revision and no doubt the revision will be upwards -- at least, I hope it will -- as far as we can go in the light of the whole civil service and other departments. It is quite impossible to deal with one department independently in these matters. Naturally, I would like to see the inspectors get just as much as they can; on the other hand, in order not to put them too far out of line with other qualified men in other departments who are doing other types of work, we have to take the whole thing under consideration, that is, referring to revision.

I must admit that there are some school principals in the province who are now being paid higher salaries than some of our own inspectors. That is a situation which has developed quite recently and rather rapidly as a result of some salary changes which have taken place in a number of municipalities. That is an embarrassment. There is no doubt about it, that is an embarrassment; on the other hand, we do not know, we cannot always adjust our salary schedules, just because some local boards may see fit and find itself able to do so at a certain time. We have to consider the whole provincial situation and move as progressively as we can under all the circumstances; but I can assure the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) that the revision is now under consideration and should be settled within a very few days.

Vote No. 38 and vote No. 39 agreed to.

On Vote 40.

MR. C. H. MILLARD (York West): Mr. Chairman, on vote 40, we have both vocational, educational branch and the trade schools branch. I would like to ask from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter): regarding on the second page we have large amounts, then we find that the Ryerson Institute of Technology is listed down further in the Estimates. I would like to have an explanation of how it is established that the vocational educational branch has a separate item for $109,000. and the trade schools branch has only $7,400.

(TAKE "QQ" FOLLOWS)

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman that the question of trade schools in this province is a very important question and this whole question of trade training is a very important question and I would like to know what the policy of the government is with respect to this matter and what this investment of $7,500.00 represents. I believe I was told last year when I asked a similar question that this only represents the introduction department.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: It is a two by four Department down in the Department of Education and all they do is go out and inspect these schools before they are licenced to carry on. In other words, these trade schools are a private enterprise proposition.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: And all the Department of Education is doing in that line is to inspect these schools to see that they deliver the course they agree to deliver and charge reasonable fees and commissions and so on.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: I would like to know if there is anything under revision in regard to the question of trade training because it seems to me as I indicated previously that we are falling short of our requirements. Now, there may be that organized labour has some responsibility at this point, it may be that employers have some responsibility at this point but I think the Department of Education, this government, has some responsibility and it should not be necessary down in the years to come that when we run short of skilled mechanics and skilled help that we have to send abroad to get them. In other words, let somebody else train them and then we pick

them up and bring them over here as is being arranged at the present time. I would like to know whether there is any real consideration being given where children will be able to get a curriculum, will be offered a curriculum whereby they will be able to get a certain amount of academic training and the opportunity for higher educational facilities plus trade training. I do not think it necessarily follows that people who are going to become skilled mechanics, in the building trades and in the other industries,

follows that they should not have other advantages of education. It seems to me they should be able to learn a trade or a calling of that kind. There was a report made on this question back in the year 1917 or 1910 which I think is forgotten now. I had the book last year and there is very little being done about this question of trade training over the years. I know from the report of the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) and from this Trade Schools Inspection Branch that certain regulations have been established and certain instructions to take by the public against people who would try to exploit the natural desire on the part of a lot of people to take further training along trade lines and I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), is there an estimate in the Department of Education through this Trade Schools Branch Inspection Department, is there any estimate as to how much money the people of Ontario, the students in Ontario are paying to privately operated Trade Schools in this province? What is the estimate of the amount of money that is being expended for this purpose and what is the degree of inspection or standards that these people are required to live up to in these various vocational training schools that are being carried on.

I have asked a certain question in the Order Paper and I do not mind telling the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that I have had a visitation from representatives of the Chicago Training Corporation as a result of that question. While it is in the riding of York, West I have not had the opportunity yet of accepting the invitation that was extended to me to inspect this particular school. I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) what is the situation, what are the prospects in regard to this whole question of trade training?

MR. PORTER: Any other questions on this point?

MR. SALSBERG: Not on that point.

MR. PORTER: Well now, Mr. Chairman, of course I will just outline broadly what the different branches of what might be called trade training or, that would be too specialized a word for it, vocational training in its broader sense. There are 38 vocational schools in the province of Ontario with an enrollment of 30,000. They, of course, carry certain practical courses up to a certain point, they are not finishing schools in a sense but they lay a foundation and give certain academic training along with it for high school age pupils.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, may I just interrupt? Are those schools not largely exploratory?

MR. PORTER: I would not say so.

MR. MILLARD: Is it not a matter of deciding or attempting to find out whether they are interested in a certain thing?

MR. PORTER: Oh, I would not say that at all. The se vocational schools as they have developed over the last 20 years or more have really become established as a

very sound part of our whole educational system. Now they do not turn out fully apprenticed people in a sense, there is further training that has to be taken after they leave vocational schools if they are going into some trade that requires apprenticeship. It is not a substitute for that but it gives a grounding on the principles of certain trades and the use of certain machinery and certain types of tools in conjunction with certain academic courses. The emphasis, however, in these schools is on the vocational points, the emphasis on the high schools or collegiate institutes is on the academic side but those who are not so gifted along that line, they find something in the vocational schools.

Then, of course, there are the technical institutes which are a senior branch of the vocational system. In later years we have had The Ryerson Institute, The Lakehead Technical Institute, the Textile Institute at Hamilton for the textile trade and the Mining Institute at Haileybury and those are all a type of technical Institutes which train people for other types of trades. It trains people who have got as far as Grade XII in the high school, it takes them from there on, it is, in a sense, a substitute for a university course for people who do not wish or perhaps have not funds enough to go through a university course. It is providing a very great need which is growing and has been very successful.

Now, in conjunction with the Ryerson course, the regular courses at Ryerson, there are two trade courses in the other sense in that they are leading towards apprenticeship. The Department of Labour is very much concerned with them from that point of view. They have to work in with the apprenticeship Act, that is automobile mechanics and

building trades. It is proposed now to extend the building trades end of it considerably and a new building will be required and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley) has plans to carry that out in conjunction with the Department of Education. We have been approached by the building trades, both employers and labour in the building trade who have requested some extension of that type of training. Most of the Ryerson courses are perhaps a little more technical than that but nevertheless we are trying to provide more and more broader outlets, new outlets for people who want all types of technical training. I think we have progressed quite well. There is still a great deal to be done but these things require experts to run them, you have to get trained men to run them and this type of training started during the last war, a great deal of it started during the war and post-war years and it has been extended since.

As to the Training School Branch, the hon. member (Mr. Millard) is quite correct when he says it is simply an inspection branch for private enterprise trade schools that are starting up in different parts of the province and they runnthemselves. I would think that in time eventually we will encourage more and more of these schools. In the meantime, these schools are filling a need apparently and I may say we have no estimate of the money spent in the private trade schools. We have no statistics on that.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is finished that point, do you not think that it would be well to find out what this type of supplementary education is costing our people? It seems to me these bodies are being inspected, certainly the inspector ought to have the right to find out what the fees are and the kind of business these people

are doing. Otherwise, I do not see how the Department is going to be in a position to say what the requirements are. If we are going to undertake that work as a province I think we ought to know what the enrollment and the courses that are being taken, those that are most popular, what the need is. Otherwise, we are not in a position to decide what policy is required.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) whether schools such as the Textile School is operated by a separate Board or directly by the Department and if it is by a separate B oard has labour a place on that Board?

MR. PORTER: Well, the Textile Institute is operated in a way similar to the way the Ryerson Institute is operated. It is really operated directly by the Department although there is a committee that guides the sort of things that are taught and the way they are taught. The Committee is made up of people in the industry. I have not the names of the people on that committee but I can easily furnish them to the hon. member (Mr. Salsberg). I know that in the Ryerson Institute where labour unions are involved, they have representation of the unions on the committee. I cannot off hand answer that question about the Textile Institute but I can get the answer.

MR. SALSBERG: I know it is the case at Ryerson but I was wondering whether in this special industry since, as a matter policy, the government makes it his business to see that a representative of that industry is included in that committee or Board, whatever you call it. I might say while I am on my feet, I think that should be the policy. Undoubtedly organized groups of textile workers in the locality where the Institute is located, as a matter of policy, should be

asked to send along representatives for such a school.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, again on the Ryerson Institute, my information is that the buildings at the Ryerson Institute are badly overcrowded.

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: And some of the same conditions exist there as exist in the Normal School as described by the member for York East (Miss Macphail).

MR. PORTER: I cannot disagree with that.

MR. MILLARD: Well, it seems to me there is a drive for higher enrollment in this school, considerable advertisements are put out setting forth the courses available and seeking enrollment at the Ryerson Institute while reporting buildings highly overcrowded. I understood from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) that the Department of Labour is interested and they intend to build a new building. Here again it seems to me to be a matter of priority, if we are not able to get steel to build a Workmen's Compensation building and not able to get steel to build other buildings, the possibility is that we are not going to get the steel to build a new building at the Ryerson Institute.

My further information is that the instructors and teachers in the Ryerson Institute who have to be technically qualified, they are being paid less even than the secondary school teachers in Toronto, that is male secondary school teachers in Toronto. Now, here they are living in Toronto, teaching in Toronto in a provincial school, they have high technical skills in addition to their teaching training and yet they are underpaid.

(TAKE "RR" FOLLOWS)

Now it seems to me that in this case they cannot be treated simply as public servants, simply as civil servants, even though they are working directly for the Department. In other words the Department in this case is the employer rather than a school board such as a school board in Toronto, but it seems to me that they ought to be paid at least comparable rates based on their training and based on their responsibilities and their qualifications.

In the case of the Ryerson Institute, I understand it is doing a tolerably good job under many handicaps at the present time, but they are certainly not getting the encouragment that the situation would seem to require if they are going to be effective, and my second point, Mr. Chairman, is this, if the Ryerson Institute has proved successful during the war and since, when re we going to get some more Ryerson Institutes across this province, because it seems to me to be altogether incongruous with the situation and the needs to have one single school of this type when we might require two or three or more.

I would like to have those questions answered by the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) because it seems to me this is the only item under which these questions can be properly and suitably raised.

MR. PORTER: I may say that there is not actually a drive for enrolment in a sense, but there is a response to many enquiries by boards and schools and individuals to the Ryerson Institute. The information the hon. member (Mr. Millard) has noticed is not so much a promotional drive as it is giving information that has been sought.

It is quite true that, as the hon. member (Mr. Millard) says, building is a matter of priority. You simply have to face reality in these things, but even though a building is cramped, it must be remembered that during the rehabilitation

period at Ryerson they were running on two shifts a day, they had one crowd coming in, I think they were running into the thousands who made use of that building every day, and that shows you what can be done in a pinch. If we simply folded our hands because we could not get the steel to build new buildings, and denied people the right to some of these courses that they want just because it was a little overcorwded, I do not think we would be doing the right thing. Some of our schools are very crowded. The hon. member for York East (Miss MacPhail) when she described the Normal School, I must say I could not take any exception to the description of the building. It is a temporary arrangement out there, it is an old public school and it was simply used until a new school was to be built. And it must be built, we cannot wait very long about it, either.

However, that is just an example. You go up to many parts of our country and I have seen schools in some parts of the country where they are running two shifts a day, high schools, because they say they are too crowded and they say they cannot get the building under way. Well, it is the semw with the Ryerson, it has expanded, it has grown and many of those buildings are temporary buildings anyway. It is not suitable, we know that, but we hope it will be one of the very first things that can be built from now on. That is about the most I can say.

I also agree with the view that the time has come or will soon come for branches of that sort in other parts of the country. There is no doubt about that.

MR. F. O. ROBINSON (Port Arthur): Mr. Chairman, under vote 40, the Lakehead Technical Institute located in the city of Port Arthur, I think it can be said now, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter) that this institute has certainly justified its existence, to say the least. And in keeping with what has been

said in the last few momen s, it is a subject very dear to my heart.

I am a machinist b trade and I can say quite proudly that in the last year of my apprenticeship I was given charge of the apprentices in the mechancis' department of the Canadian National Railways at Winnipeg. I had over 100 boys under my jurisdiction before I had completed my own apprenticeship. I was teaching the school when those hundred boys attended, learning the machinists trade. Returning to Port Arthur I taught at the night school both wartime emergency classes and the regular night classes, and I have followed with a great deal of interest the growth of the Lakehead Technical Institute.

I feel, Mr. Minister (Mr. Porter) that the time is past when we should make a real effort to expand this institution, to put it in permanent buildings on the site that the city of Port Arthur has provided for it and give the school an opportunity to expand, because it has now arrived at a stage in its life where it cannot hope to fulfill its present duties let alone its possibility of expansion in its present building.

I would not want to be misunderstood, we are most grateful to have had that temporary building and have the experiment carried out, but I think it can be said now that the experiment is reasonably successful and the full possibilities of the Lakehead Technical Institute cannot be realized in the building where it is now situated. It has no grounds, it has no room for expansion, it has not g ot the attractiveness that a school of that type should have to a prospective student.

I would say this also, I have always been a believer that a great deal could be done in this channel. There is always the argument of whether it is right and wise to spend a good deal of money equipping a school with machinery and so on to teach certain trades, and I believe, and I know the

hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) agrees with me as he said last year, that there is a great field and grest possibilities for giving the student the actual practical training, the learning and the opportunity in the shop and then removing him from the shop and taking him into the school at certain hours and sayd of the week and give him his cademic training in t at way. I believe if that was done, he could learn exactly the subjects closely related to his trade. He would gain a large, broader education in ot er lines if it was properly carried out, and I elieve there is n enormous field for the Lakehead Technical Institute for that, but only if it is given the opportunity, but it cannot do it in its present quarters.

I do not want to prolong the debate on is question, but I do plead with the government to extend the Lakehead Technical Institute into a permanent building at the earliest possible moment so that it can properly serve the job it is now trying to do and can grow into the great field of expansion which no doubt exists for it.

MR. PORTER: I concur in what the hon. member (Mr. Robinson) has said. I cannot add very much more than what I said to the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard). The problem is much the same.

I might say for the benefit of the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg)---Mr. A. F. Knight of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada is a member of the Advisory Committee of the Textile Institute and Mr. J. Robinson of the Textile Workers Union of America, of Hamilton, is also on that Committee.

MR. SALSBERG: Very good.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Ryerson Institute, I do not wish to strike a sour note, because as others said, the Ryerson Institute has done some excellent

work. I do wish to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) whether due consideration has been given to what might be called vocational guidance in connection with technical training. After all, the training is costly both to student and to the Province of Ontario.

I have in mind for example the course or courses being given at the Ryerson Institute in radio work.

MR. PORTER: That is a very touchy subject.

SO E hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Now, a considerable number of our young people have taken courses in radio work at the Ryerson Institute---script writing and so on---and as part of their courses have taken part in programmes over the Ryerson Institutes' own station, which the hon. member (Mr. Porter) may have listened to in his leisure time---if he has any leisure time.

MR. PORTER: They haven't said anything wrong on that station yet?

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, not that I know of. I do not have too much time to listen to it myself, b t this is the point about which I am concerned. Here you have a considerable number of young people taking a rather lengthy course in the techniques of radio production, in which I am quite satisfied only a small percentage of them will ever be employed. The field is a very limited field, there are not too many radio stations in Canada. I have forgotten the exact number but somewhere in the neighborhood of 100, about the same number as there are daily newspapers. There are not too many radio stations even in the United States, the field of employment there is very limited. But an extraordinarily large number of young people think they would like radio work, just as a surprisingly large number of young people think they would like to do newspaper work, which is something the newspapers have taken

advantage of for a great many years.

I cannot help but think that the Department and the Institute ought to give consideration to the importance of vocational guidance in this connection. I think that before young people undertake a course of two or three years' training in a very technical field where the opportunities of employment aver very, very limited, that they should be told more about the limitations in that particular field of employment. There is considerable expense involved for these young people and for their families and for the Province of Ontario, and I am not satisfied that they have been told the facts of life about these matters.

Now, on the points my hon. friend the member for Port Arthur (Mr. Robinson) raises, that is a different matter, where you provide training for people in the machinist trade or in other fields of production. That is a very different matter. Unless we enter another depression, Canada sadly needs more people trained in trades of that dkind. But a disastrous number of young people are attracted by apparently glamorous professions such as radio or the press where the opportunities are very limited indeed, and I think in those fields particularly there is a great need for more vocational guidance. I wonder just how much has been attempted at a place like the Ryerson Institute?

(Take SS follows)

I am sure the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter), even though he may be a layman, like myself, will see at once how absurd it is for a considerable number of children to be taking training in radio, when there are so few jobs in radio in Canada, and even in the United States.

MR. PORTER: Of course, the people who go to Ryerson are 18 years or older. They are mature people.

MR. MILLARD: Not very mature.

MR. PORTER: The hon. member (Mr. Millard) thinks they should have the right to vote. They are mature, and know which way they want to go. They have guidance in the high schools when they leave; they have access to the Advisory Committees at the Institute when they go there, and the Advisory Committees of the Institute are very careful to see that this different courses are not over-crowded, and they will not be flooding the market in anyone line of activity. That is one of the purposes of the Advisory Committee. That is one of the reasons why the Labour Representatives on the Committee are so vitally important, because they know how many should be encouraged to go into any particular line. The people who have graduated in radio work in Ryerson, according to the last information I have, have all been favourable placed. It is extraordinary, how well they were placed. It is true there are certain limits to radio work, but it is extraordinary how they were favourably placed. There are a great many small new stations, like the one at St. Thomas, which have been opening up, and all they need are good people to talk to them. It is surprising how the industry has been expanding, and with the television coming in, their techniques will be useful to the new business

opening up. If there are any signs of it becoming overcrowded, we can guide people away from it.

MR. MILLARD: I notice since we started the estimates of the Department of Education, that the date has changed, and it is now Friday, the 16th of March.

MR. PORTER: I never would have guessed it.

MR. MILLARD: So I assume it has taken two days. I wondered if the motion we passed that we meet at 2 o'clock meant that we were meeting at 2 o'clock in the morning on Friday, or 2 o'clock in the afternoon?

I do not know if we are going to continue this or not. There are quite a number of questions I assure you I would like to ask, and they are not privileged questions; they are questions intended to bring out eertain very definite information, and I am quite content to sit on till the small hours --

MR. PORTER: The hon. Premier (Mr. Frost) will be back in a few minutes. The hon. member (Mr. Millard) could go on with these questions. All these speeches just prolong it. I am not objecting to the hon. member (Mr. Millard) asking questions, but these speeches about adjournment --

MR. MILLARD: I do not object. It was said we were going to have an "evening session", and we have gone on until half past twelve, and although I am rather rugged, and I can stand it, I do not think it is fair --

MR. PORTER: Wait until the hon. Leader of the House (Mr. Frost) returns.

MR. MILLARD: I assumed you were leading the House.

MR. PORTER: In his absence, yes.

MR. MILLARD: I want to ask about this provincial training project, item 11, Vote No. 40 "Apprentice Training" and so forth. I would like an explanation as to what that actually means "$160,000.00 for Training Apprentices". Is that for salary,wages, and so forth? Where is this training taking place? Is it taking place in the Ryerson Institute, or is it part of the training in conjunction with employment, or what is this item, No. 11?

MR. PORTER: That refers to the two schools I mentioned at the Ryerson, The Motor Mechanics, and the Building Trades. It is carried on in conjunction with the Department of Labour. It is Apprenticeship training, and there is some financial arrangement between the two departments as to that. That covers the question.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, is there some arrangement that when these people have completed their apprenticeship training courses, they then are going on to employment, or what is the arrangement for taking care of these people.

Hon. CHARLES DALEY (Minister of Labour): You mean in the construction trades?

MR. MILLARD: Yes.

MR. DALEY: In the construction trades, these boys are already apprenticed to someone.

MR. PORTER: They spend some time on the job, as I understand it - correct me if I am wrong -- and then they come in for a few weeks course at the school, and go out on the job again, and in due time they complete their Articles, and in that way they get some classroom training.

MR. MILLARD: Then, the last question on that item is this; how many apprentices are sharing in the benefits

of this training, and included in this item of $160,000.00? How many apprentices have we got?

MR. PORTER: Theere were 1137 trained in 1950. That is, the apprentices.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would not be possible for the hon. members -- and particularly the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) to go and sit in at some convenient time with the Director of Education and get all of this information which may be of interest to him but honestly which I think is of very little interest to the rest of the hon. members of the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: At this time of the morning?

MR. FROST: There is no reason why he should not have the information but, really, for the rest of us to sit here and go through this is rather needless. I think there is one logical approach to most of this.

We are most anxious to give to the hon. members of the House particulars of what we are doing. I would say, if the hon. member (Mr. Millard), or any other hon. member of the House, would like to sit in for a few hours with the Director of Education, that could easily be arranged. There is no secret about it. It is all available to the hon. members, and we are most anxious to give it to them.

Surely, there is a logical approach to this. I may say, Mr. Chairman, I am not anxious to keep the hon. members here, but we have a great deal of work to do, and to get through one and one-half estimates in hours and hours, and hours, just does not add up. Surely there is a way of cutting this down and abbreviating it, so we can get through. We want to give all the essential information possible. Surely

there is a way of getting this in some more efficient manner.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is a reasonable man, therefore, I trust that he will listen to what I have to say about this in a spirit of reason.

This is the third consecutive Session of the 23rd Legislature at which the estimates of the Department of Education have been commenced late at night.

MR. FROST: We wanted to start them earlier.

MR. JOLLIFFE: All right, let us assume that. Every year the Education Department's estimates come on very late at night.

This is one of the most important Provincial responsibilities, and we are asked to vote nearly $60,000,000 on account of this Department. I am serious about this. It is an important Department. The expenditures are enormous; the issues are important. Many of them may be non-political, but I think they are well worthwhile discussing, and I do not think we should begrudge the time necessary to spend on them.

MR. FROST: We do not begrudge the time, but since my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) has been in Opposition, every year I have heard the same old questions answered time and time again, and I wonder when we will reach the point where the questions will be answered to the satisfaction of reasonable people.

MR. JOLLIFFE: What questions?

MR. FROST: All these questions. The same questions

which were asked tonight, and the same speeches. They are repeated every Session from the other side, every time these estimates come up. Is there not a way we can get around this, and answer these questions. After all, there is some new information the hon. members want, but it is really boresome to listen to the same old record --

MR. JOLLIFFE: What question has taken time here.

MR. FROST: Well, on the vocational estimates. I have heard it a dozen times.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Maybe the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has heard it a dozen times, but we do not all get answers.

MR. PORTER: No one suggested you did not get the answers.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The estimates of this very important Department come on late at night. And nobody likes to sit late at night. As a matter of fact, I do not think anybody in this House is enamored of night sessions, at any time.

MR. FROST: No, certainly not.

MR. JOLLIFFE: But when we have to sit late, along come the estimates of the Department of Education, and then when it gets to twenty minutes of one, as it is now, it is easy to get the impression that the Opposition is being obstructive. We did not select this particular estimate.

MR. FROST: I gave plenty of notice about this. I suggested that we should end the Department of Municipal Affairs by six o'clock, and we should go on with the Department of Education at 8 o'clock, but it took several hours to deal with the Department of Municipal Affairs.

I came up here about half past ten. I was delayed

elsewhere, and I was not making any radio broadcast; I was engaged in rather pleasant business, but to my amazement, the House was still on municipal affairs, and some of the people who listened to it, told me they never heard like it in all the days of their life.

Whose fault is it we are sitting here at a quarter to one? Surely there is a matter of reason and common sense. I know it may sound ridiculous, but I have seen the estimates all passed in one night -- all of them.

MR. HARRY NIXON (Brant): I recall that myself.

MR. FROST: It seems reasonable, if we could do it in a night -- although I think it is absurd -- surely we can do one Department in two or three hours. The point is, I think, we have some other business to discuss.

MR. JOLLIFFE: This is it, as far as I am concerned.

MR. FROST:, This is important, but there are reams and reams of nonsense in this thing -- just pure nonsense. It is a matter of the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) just putting on the same old record over and over again.

May I make this suggestion? We have some very important things to do. I would like tomorrow if possible to deal with the Election Act, and the Voters List Act. That has nothing to do with the imminence of an election or otherwise. It is ordinary business that is of interest to our people. To be frank with you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the Milk Control Bill tomorrow afternoon, if it can be done. I think it is very important.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Has it been printed yet?

MR. FROST: We might clear that up. After all, it is an important piece of business. We can deal with that,

and then when some of the hon. members have gone at 3.15, we can proceed with some routine work. I think we should be able to clear up the rest of this tonight. All the questions which are relevant, may be asked in half an hour. Let us get on with it, and be done with it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) has been very good at this Session. He has carried a heavy load, without losing his temper --

MR. FROST: I am not losing my temper at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am not suggesting he is. I want to make sure he does not.

I am not suggesting these estimates are not important; they are very important, and if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) wants to avoid delay, he should not make it a practice of calling the Department of Education's estimates late at night, because he is dealing with the wrong kind of people, if he wants to do it that way.

I would think after his experiences in 1949 and 1950, that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) would know it is no good to call the Education Estimates at 10 o'clock at night, in an effort to slip them through that way.

MR. FROST: I am not slipping them through at all.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why all this complaint. Let me make this perfectly clear. The question of the position of the Opposition side of the House will not necessarily satisfy the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), but for that we make no apology. We will have to do our work as we think best. If we are going to spend half an hour discussing whether or not time is being wasted, it should not be done in connection with the department on which $60,000,000 is to be spent.

(TAKE "TT" FOLLOWS)

If we are going to spend half an hour at this time of the night discussing whether or not time is being wasted then it should not be done in connection with the Department for which $26 million is estimated to be spent.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): Clean them up.

On Vote 41.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And, incidentally, as far as the Milk Control Bill is concerned, it has not been printed. There is a lot about it in the morning paper.

MR. FROST: You all applauded this afternoon. I thought you would be all for it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: We applauded the explanation of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Goodfellow); but, let us see the Bill. After all, with respect to the delay in the explanation, I do not know why ---

MR. C.C. CALDER (London): Mr. Chairman --

MR. FROST: Don't you get into this.

MR. CALDER:: ---one reason wh have been getting on well tonight is for once this House has settled down. I compliment the hon. member for York, West (Mr. Millard). I think we have been trying to do a decent job and we have been getting good answers. This is a question which was not heard last year. It relates to the London Normal School. Last year I accomplished it, I think, by a gery genteel exchange of notes such as might pass between hostile powers, asking the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to consult with his colleague, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Doucett) and get that school improved. It is not a makeshift school; it is a school built as a normal school and it ought to be maintained better as such. In view of what the hon. member for West York (Mr. Millard) said this year I do not think anything further need be said at this session.

I want to give the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) fair warning and, through him, to his superb staff, that if in the coming year the improvements which are a trust the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) desires should be made, are not made, it will become my unpleasant duty to lambaste him next year in the most exquisite parliamentary language.

MR. FROST: We would not want to be lambasted by the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder). That would be really terrible.

MR. G.B. ELLIS (Essex North): Mr. Chairman, I would like to reiterate a plea I made in respect of these Estimates last year and the year before. Last year I had to wait around, I think it was, until 3:30 in the morning before I had an opportunity to get down to this particular vote. This year I am two hours ahead of myself.

MR. PORTER: Give us your question. I will be delighted to answer it.

MR. ELLIS: What I would like to point out to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) is that we have normal schools located, according to this vote, in London, in Hamilton, in North Bay, in Ottawa --

MR. FROST: And other points.

MR. ELLIS: --- Stratford and Toronto. Down in Essex County we have a population of approximately 250,000 people, we have some very fine schools, and we also have young people who have to leave the county and go to other places to get normal school education. My plea is that I would like the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to give us a little more definite answer this year. When are we going to get a normal school in Essex County? Last year we were

told the matter was under consideration. Let us not have that this year. We understand all these normal schools are filled to overflowing. We can definitely stand expansion of our present normal schools. I say to you, that the logical place for a new normal school, speaking of location, is in Essex County. I would ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to give me an answer this time, not "the matter has been under consideration." It has been under consideration ever since I have been here. Give us an answer as to what the Department of Education intends to do in respect of building or placing a normal school in Essex County.

MR. PORTER: I will make no commitment on that.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): The answer is "no".

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is this the same Minister?

MR. PORTER: I do not mind questions. It is perfectly legitimate to have questions stated fully to the extent necessary, but when a question is mixed with a prolonged speech about the view of the hon. member involved on this, that and the other matter, I do not think that is proper on Estimates.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Does the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) say opinions cannot be expressed?

MR. PORTER: I remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that I am on my feet.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Minister of Education may be on his feet but he is away off the beam.

MR. PORTER: I am talking.

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the hon. member for London (Mr. Calder) that these discussions can be very enjoyable at the expense of the taxpayers but the business involved on Estimates is the items involved and if the hon. member for

Essex North (Mr. Ellis) wants to ask a question let him do so. He asked the question, made a speech, and he asked the question, made another speech, and he asked the question again and made another speech; but the answer is I can make no commitment.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Where does the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) get the idea there is anything wrong in the expression of an opinion?

MR. SALSBERG: How do your colleagues do it in Ottawa?

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I say to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that expression of opinion, whether it is mixed with the question or not, is perfectly proper, except in totalitarian countries.

MR. ELLIS: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word with respect to the reply by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). I have not discussed anything under the Estimates of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter). I well remember the remarks elicited from the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) when I introduced a Bill. I will say if that is the way the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) wants to conduct affairs then I want to discuss every Estimate from now on. Now, I will ask plenty of questions.

MR. THOMAS (Elgin): We will stay until you are through.

MR. ELLIS: On vote 41, I want to know the condition of the Normal School in Hamilton, the condition under which the students now attending it are being taught. That is my first question.

MR. FROST: Is there a Normal School in Hamilton?

MR. JOLLIFFE: It is under item 10, Vote 41.

MR. PORTER: The conditions are very similar to those in other normal schools.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do youto accept the ruling of the Chair that Vote 41 has passed?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Why should the Chairman make such a ruling when there has been a debate going on between the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Ellis) and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter)?

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a point for the Chair to decide.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The Chairman's functions are not arbitrary.

MR. FROST: Might I suggest that we have not any desire to escape from answering any legitimate questions we can be asked. After all, this is a democratic country and I would like to say that we like to be reasonable with people. I think perhaps --

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not like that word "permit" in a democratic country.

MR. FROST: I think perhaps we had better cool down and get down to business.

I would say that we ought to clear the Estimates of this Department now. Let us go ahead and finish it up, like reasonable people and if there are legitimate questions to be asked, ask them and we will try and answer them. We can answer them. I suggest that the hon. member for St. David (Mr. Dennison) if there are technical matters about how many Indians there are at schools on Manitoulan Island, drop in and see the Director of Information, and that information will be forthcoming without any delay. I think that is the reasonable way of doing it.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Subject to our right to express our opinion as we see fit.

MR. FROST: I have not any objection to that. I like to see the hon. members express their opinions. If they are good, I always listen to them.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) should realize that if we were to rely for our sustenance here on getting the answers we want to our questions, we would have a very thin time, indeed, because the answers are very seldom available.

MR. A. CHARTRAND (Ottawa East): I find there is an item in respect of the University of Ottawa Normal School involving $90,800.

AN hon. MEMBER: Involving an item of -- ?

MR. CHARTRAND; I presume it is not the intention of the government to close this normal school in the near future.

Vote 41 agreed to.

On Vote 42.

MR. C. H. MILARD (York West): On vote 42, I would ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to explain --

MR. SALSBERG: I want to ask a question on item 15, but if the hon. member for York West (Mr. Millard) wants to ask a question with respect to a previous item, I will wait.

MR. MILLARD: It does not matter.

MR. FROST: Go ahead.

MR. SALSBERG: On item 15, Education Services for the Handicapped for whom no other provisions can be made,

this is a very important problem, which I see a provision of $18,000. for, which seems a rather small amount. I am asking a question. This question was raised here during the Estimates a year or two ago in connection with the discussion which went on in Toronto at the time about the establishment of a special school for handicapped children for whom there is no proper provision for education. Can the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) tell the House for what this $18,000. is, whether that includes the department's share of the cost of educating such children, and what experience has been gained, in an effort to establish a special school in the city for such children?

MR. PORTER: This item is for those who cannot attend school. In many of the rural areas, there is this provision made for tuition in the home, in some cases. It varies, according to condition, in many respects. That is for what that item provides. It has nothing to do with the school the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Salsberg) mentions. That school under discussion in Toronto was for a certain class of non-academic children, as they are called, and the question arose as to whether it was primarily a medical problem or an educational problem. The medical authorities took the position that the emphasis should be on the medical side of it and they claim that they should run and control any such institution. We are inclined to agree with them. We think that it is something which cannot entirely be handled by education. It requires much more than that. Of course, the Toronto matter was a local matter. They were in touch with the various departments. I do not know whether they came to any definite decision in Toronto or not.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry to take time with respect to this matter but it is important in my opinion. Most hon. members for Toronto, I know, have been approached at one time or another by parents of such unfortunate children; in fact, there is an organization of such parents. They approached the Board of Education many times about this problem. The Board of Education told them that they required special assistance from the province to re-establish such a school. I am not an authority. I cannot determine whether the medical point of view is correct or the straight educational point of view is correct. It is certainly an educational problem as far as the parents are concerned. The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) refers to those children as uneducationable --

MR. PORTER: I did not use that word: I said "non-academic" . That is the word which is generally applied with respect to them. "Uneducationable" I do not think is a correct expression because that would indicate there was no use of attempting to educate them at all. That is not so. Education can be of assistance.

MR. SALSBERG: Theremust have been some valuable experiences gained from schools for such children in areas in the United States. I think we all agree that it is a problem which falls within the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. Whether it should be done in association with or in conjunction with the medical profession, or not, is something for specialists to determine; but I do suggest that when we are on this item we should try to arrive at some understanding as to what the Department of Education can do to help the municipalities to cope with this problem.

It is more open in Toronto only because the number of such children is greater than in the smaller communities. I am sure it exists everywhere. There is at the moment no provision for such children.

(TAKE "UU" FOLLOWS)

I know of cases where parents send their children in this category to the ordinary public schools and it is a very unhappy experience for some of these children; they go through torture by normal children, they are mishandled very often and naturally their parents suffer greatly because of it. I suggest that the Department should have a policy on it. From what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) has said there is no policy in the Department towards that special type of child. I am sorry that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is discussing with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) now.

MR. [illegible]: We are listening to every word you say.

MR. SALSBERG: I am quite certain the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would not say anything that is not true and when he says he is listening he is listening. That helps matters considerably. I was emphasizing the point that the Department does not seem to have a policy towards these children and it is clear from what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) said now, I think it is high time the Department established a policy,for everyone will know what the Department's views are and what they are prepared to do to cope with the problem that is paramount in those families that are immediately affected by it.

MR. PORTER: I do not think there is anything more I can say.

MR. SALSBERG: If you have any policy I think the least you can do is assure the House that the Department will deal with this question and you will shortly issue a statement of policy.

MR. PORTER: I have answered the question, I cannot

do any more.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, it is a very unsatisfactory answer for the Hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to say he has no policy. It may not affect thousands of families --

MR. PORTER: I did not say I had no policy, I said I answered your question as best I could, there is nothing more to say. It is you who say I have no policy.

MR. SALSBERG: You said the medical people have an opinion and you are inclined to agree with them.

MR. PORTER: I did not say I agreed with anything.

MR. SALSBERG: You said you agreed and the records will show. I am not picking an argument.

MR. PORTER: I have nothing else to say.

MR. SALSBERG: I must say it is a very careless way to dispose of a question that is so serious to so many people.

MR. PORTER: You asked a question and it was answered.

MR. SALSBERG: It is not answered when the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) said he has no policy, I say the Department should have a policy.

MR. PORTER: You can go out and say all you like.

MR. SALSBERG: That is certainly more than a callous way of dealing with things of this sort. I think it is the nearest possible way to deal with it, highly irresponsible for the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) to say"you can say anything you like". He said he had no policy and a few minutes before he said he agreed with the medical people and for the families affected I assure him there is no more important in life. I do think the matter should

be studied and the House assured that you will have a policy announced within a reasonable time.

MR. R. SCOTT ((Beaches) : Mr. Chairman, on this matter I will not say very much but about a month ago I went to a meeting in Bloor Street Collegiate in which there were hundreds and hundreds of parents of these children who were gathered to hear an address by a leader in these matters from Detroit. After the meeting I spoke to the parents of these children and they claimed that the difficulty was not that they could not train teachers but they had no facilities because no one would take any responsibility for it. What I want to know is what responsibility do you assume in this field or what responsibility do you think you are prepared to assume. Can I get an answer to that?

MR. PORTER: If you are going to sit down.

MR. SCOTT (Beaches): Yes, I am.

MR. PORTER: Well, as I explained on other years there is an experimental school which is at Kirkland Lake and it has been carrying on this sort of instruction for some years with some measure of success. Now, we are not ready yet to enter into any large program of this kind, we are not ready to do it. Methods have not yet been sufficiently proven.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I am going to make it as brief as possible on Vote No. 42. Under items 7, 8 and 9, under the Section labeled " Audio, visual education", I would like to point to the Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) and to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) that I have been trying to deal with questions tonight, very serious questions that involves this policy. I am not

bickering over the amounts except where these amounts appear to be adequate to carry out a policy that will effected. Now, in this question of audio, visual education I think that most hon. members -- before I ask my question -- will agree that for the purchase, repair and setting up of a full film department, $80,000 does not appear to be out of the way if there is going to be aby extensive audio, visual education. It seems to me that these talking films are not only a good way of doing it but an inexpensive way of doing it, but I want to point out that there is a parallel service being rendered in a community's program by the National Film Board.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is there any co-operation between the National Film Board where they have machines, where they have licenced or qualified operators in all districts today would be available particularly during the school hours to carry on for the Department of Education. And now, what is the policy that prevails in that particular field?

Now, what are the arrangements and how extensive is it in our educational system, this question of radio broadcasts? The matter will evidently come up again when we get the script for the broadcast that was made yesterday but I would like to know from the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) what is happening and what can be done, if this is a good system and I think it has been proven a good system of doing it, then it seems to me that that privilege ought to be extended to all the children in the province of Ontario so far as possible. That is going to mean a great deal more

traveling and a great deal of expenses in this particular department and it seems to me that $126,000 is a small item. If you are going to do a job in this Department it is a small item compared with the other departments.

MR.PETTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that this is such a small item when you consider what the purpose of this expenditure is. The $80,000 item is for the purpose of pruchasing films and repairing films. The Department keeps quite an extensive Film Library covering all sorts of subjects educational in nature and I can assure the hon. members it is entirely non-policital, nothing to do with anything political. These films are sent out to the different schools and one school will receive them, certain classes, and then it will be circulated around to other schools that use these projection machines. I have attended some of the schools where they use it and the way they do it is simply this, they have a film of some type of wild animal, they want to show the habits of the animal and what it looks like, and what it grows like, what it eats, and so on. They have a very interesting film to show the whole growth of the animal and different stages and all the rest of it and after this with a talking script the teacher asks the children certain questions about what they saw and they get a very clear idea. Now, that is what that is for, it is for the distribution of these films and for the preparation of these scripts. For the broadcast we use the National Film Board, their projectionist goes to the schools in the rural areas where they desire them. We co-operate this. It is a supplementary means of providing informational courses

along certain lines right in the classroom. It is not an after school programme it is a classroom programme and quite effective and growing. The reason for that amount is that we have had a great demand for film and we think that is what we will need this year.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I am glad to hear that statement, particularly because I am convinced that some of the most valuable educational work that can be done in the conservation field is with the aid of films. There are two or three in particular the National Film Board have produced which are particularly effective and which, I believe, have been included in this particular group they have in the Department. I had hoped it would be pushed even farther. I think the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) will agree that there are some subjects that can be covered probably much better with a film than in any other way.

MR. MacLEOD: Mr. Chairman on this item 15 of Vote 42, I wonder if the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) could give us some idea of the number of children in that category in the province? Would you have that information?

MR. PORTER: No, I have not that information.

MR. MacLEOD: Frankly, it does seem to me that is an awfully small item to cover what is obviously a big problem. I am not suggesting for a moment that the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) would be indifferent to a serious problem of that sort but it does seem to me that he and his officials ought to go into that matter and endeavour some time during this Session;to give us some precise information as to the number of children effected. If there are only a few children in the province, well then, the estimate may be adequate, but my own impression is

that there are actually hundreds, perhaps thousands of such children in the large urban schools.

(TAKE "VV" FOLLOWS)

Now, if that is the case, then the figure of $18,000 is palpably absurd, and I know the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) is probably tired, as we all are, but I did get the impression of what he said a little earlier did him less than justice on a serious problem of this sort.

MR. PORTER: Well, as I say, I haven't that information here now. I might be able to get it.

MR. MacLEOD: Yes.

MR. PORTER: I realize the seriousness of the problem, and we have given a good deal of consideration to this problem but it is not an easy one to solve, and it is not an easy one to get a staff to undertake. Of course there are a great many children taken care of in the Orillia Institution, many of which might be perhaps more subnormal than the sort of children the hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) is speaking about. The so-called non-academic children require very, very expert care and training on the part of the teaching staff and it is very, very difficult--a very difficult problem, with very, very meagre results.

MR. MacLEOD: Would the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) not agree, though, that there probably a great many children going to the public schools now who are handicapped and who ought not to be mixing with children who are normally healthy?

MR. PORTER: No, I would not say that.

MR. MacLEOD: You do not think so?

MR. PORTER: No, I do not believe in this segregation of people who are a little different from others.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, I am not talking about people who are a little different.

MR. PORTER: Well, there are some who are subnormal, yes, if they are in the very lower subnormal categories, it might undesirable, but I think it is a great thing to have

physically handicapped people mix with normal people, because mentally they are on a par.

MR. SALSBERG: We are not talking about physically handicapped people.

MR. NIXON: Mr. Chairman, would not the local Board of Education be in this picture at all?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes.

MR. NIXON: This is just an assistance to the local Board?

MR. PORTER: That is right.

MR. MILLARD: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to finish out that question that was necess ary by reason of what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) replied. What assistance is given to schools? Here we set up a film library and we arrange radio broadcasts, now what assistance or what provision is made for the schools in the outlying districts and so on to get the equipment necessary to take advantage of the services? Is there a grant, is it allowed in with the approved costs, or does the local Board hage to supply the equipment themselves?

MR. PORTER: The regular grants are paid. It is part of the school equipment, the regular grants are paid. In some schools they get grants for equipment, in some they do not.

MR. MILLARD: It is an approved expenditure?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes.

MR. W. DENNISON (St. David): I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) to a section in vote 42 which I dealt with last year. It is summer camps, 45, 46, 47 and 48 under 42 on page 38, summer camps.

Now, last year there was an appropriation of $9,500 for salaries, this year it is reduced to $7,500. Last year the appropriation for administration was $30,000, this year it is reduced to---no, the appropriation for development and maintenance

was $30,000 for last year, this year it is $20,000.

Now, the operation has been increased from $50,000 to $60,000. I asked the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) last year--he will probably remember--if it was not a fact that this government just in 1944 promised to extend these children's camps into a coplete network of children' s camps and he said he had never heard of it?

MR. PORTER: Oh, let us get down to this item. What item is it?

MR. DENNISON : Oh, yes, at the bottom of page 38, summer camps.

MR. PORTER: I cannot remember anything about it last year. I said a lot of things last year.

MR. DENNISON: The second paragraph from the bottom.

MRL PORTER: What is the vote, now?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: 45.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The vote is 42, the item is 45.

MR. DENNISON: Items 45, 46, 47 and 48.

MR. PORTER: I think I have explained those summer camps now three times in three different years.

MR. DENNISON: Well, just once more.

AN hon. MEMBER: Once more.

MR. SALSBERG: In that case, do not look in the book and repeat it.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Oh, I am not reading from the book.

MR. FROST: How would it be if we sent the book over to you --passed the votes and sent you the book?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is there no progress made from year to year?

MR. PORTER: Oh, yes.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Then let us hear about it.

MR. PORTER: But there is no change in policy in regard to the camps. If the hon. member (Mr. Dennison) forgot what we said he last two years, I shall be glad--

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is there no change since then?

MR. PORTER: No change in the policy. Does that answer the question .

MR. DEN ISON: All right, but let me read you your promises.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. PORTER: Oh, well, I am not promising--

MR. FROST: We are not interested in promises. What are you going to read, the 22 points?

MR. PORTER: This is the way it has been handled, and I have explained the reasons, so you can shoot your face off.

MR. DENNISON: This will not take very, very long, but in July---between July--

MR. FROST: Would my hon. friend (Mr. Dennison) table that and save time, and make it a part of the record of the House? We would be glad if he would.

MR. DENNISON : Would you like me to table it?

MR. FROST: Yes.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: What is it?

MR. DENNISON: These are promises made by Mr. Drew.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

AN hon. MEMBER: Who is he?

MR. DENNISON: He starts out in Sudbury and travels over to the Manitoba border making promises of a vast network of children's camps to provide recreation for the children of the larger cities in the Southern. Part of the pro-

vince. Now, the Globe & Mail of August 26, 1944, had a headline and a whole page of pictures and in t e headline was:

"Ontario Plans Summer Camps for Children in Approved Areas of the North."

And then it said later on:

"Premier Drew recently visited several Summer camps for children and will confer with directors this Fall on best method of carrying out plan to establish camps i Northern Ontari under provincial auspices."

I will just file that. The point is t at here was a promise, and yet on the Estimates the promises are shrinking, you are not spending as much for development this year as you were last year. Do you wish this to be handed to Hansard? I will just hand it to Hansard.

"CONSERVATIVE PROMISES RE CHILDREN'S CAMPS

"From: "Kenora Miner and News, Friday, July 14, 1944

"Drew Outlines Plans for Children's Camps.

"The Drew Go ernment plansto construct summer camps for children as part of its post war program, Premier Drew said. During his recent tour of Northwestern On ario the premier visited boys' and girls' camps and discussed theproject with camp officials. First step will be the creation of a Committee composed of camp directors and this body will serve in an advisory capacity.

"The proposed camps will be open to all Ontario children. Parents able to pay will contribute a low sum, and those without the means will send their children free of cost.

"I hav e been interested for some time in the

"possibility of providing camp accommodation for school children,' the premier said. 'During my visit to Northwestern and Northern Ontario I took the opportunity to fly to many areas suitable for such camps. It is not sufficiently understood that we have in Ontario an almost unbroken chain of lakes stretching from Ottawa to the Manitoba boundary. There is no other holiday area like it in the world. It is going to provide a tremendous source of revenue to Ontario when it is made fully available to visitors from Ontario and the United States. What is of great importance to Ontario is that we have an almost unequalled opportunity to give our children a healthy, outdoor holiday under ideal conditions.

"'It is our intention as part of our postwar programme to build camps in suitable places where the children of Ontario will have the opportunity to live in the fresh air of the Northern Woods and build up their bodies in these healthful surroundings,' the premier said.

"The latest of these brought to the public attention is Premier Drew's plan to institute camps in the North Country for Ontario children. The idea appears to have much merit and should be one to receive the deserved support of all politicians, no matter what their affiliations. Such a plan is indeed looking into the future and should do much to alleviate many of the distressing home conditions which exist today for children of families in crowded Southern Ontario cities.

"Introduction of these children to the North in their formative years should also be a contfibuting factor in bringing about a migration of many of these young people when they are older. Many will unquestionably have come to love the North as do those who have spent years ther . When the time comes for them to seek their life's work, there should be many who will look to the North to provide them with a livelihood. Even for those who do not adopt the country as their own, they will have received a broader outlook and will be more sympathetic intheir future judgment of the North's problems."

MR. FROST: I will write him at once, Mr. Chairman, and ask him what he meant by all that.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DENNISON: Then I am sending this over to Hansard.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, would that not e a very happy note on which to end it, Mr. Chairman? I would like to move that the Committee do now rise and report progress.

MR. SALSBERG: I second the motion.

MR. FROST: Have you got enough hon. members here?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SALSBERG: You are defeated.

THE CHAIRMAN : Vote 42 passed.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I made a motion. And we have made a lot of progress, I think it is a perfectly reasonable motion, and in order.

MR. OLIVER: It is certainly in order.

MR. FROST: Let me suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) would it not be better---I never like being

unreasonable, but really I think we ought to get through the Estimates of this Department. We have got a great many more Estimates to come up that hon. members are anxious to hear about and then we have got some very iiportant matters. Now really I think that we have threshed over most of the old straw and new straw and other straws in connection with this matter, surely we can go ahead.

There are one or two places where my hon. friends might want to ask some questions, but in the main everything in this is familiar to us. Could we not go ahead and clear this up? It seems to me that would be the reasonable thing to do.

We have devoted a lot of time to it, surely we ought to be able to clear this Department up tonight without having to waste---and I say really "waste" another day on it. That is really what would happen. Do you not think we might go ahead and do that?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, may I explain matters to the honl Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) from our point of view. This may seem all very boring to him, but we still have before us in this Department at least three votes which are of great importance and great interest. I will not take up too much time while my hon. friend (Mr. Frost) is rounding up some more votes, but 49--I do not know whether the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is listening to what I am saying--but 49 is wit reference to the Ontario School for the Deaf, which happens to be very important to larger numbers of deaf people in this province. What policy is going to e adopted by the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) from this point on.

And, Mr. Chairman, vote 51, I would point out to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost), involves a vote totalling

$48,187,000 and the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) thinks it is a waste of time to discuss that sort of thing.

I just cannot agree, and if he were in the opposition, he would be the first to disagree.

MR. PORTER: Mr. Chairman, it is not a waste of time to discuss those items, but it has been a waste of time on the part of some hon. members to make long speeches about matters when really the questions were--

MR. FROST: I may say frankly this--

MR. JOLLIFFE: I reject this theory that all we can do is ask questions. That is "out."

MR. FROST: Now, Mr. Chairman, I have listened to this since about ten o' clock, and it is half-past one. I really have not heard anyt ing here that any sensible member of this House did not know about before we sat down here at ten o'clock.

MR. JOLLIFFE: You heard about a radio broadcast you claim you did not know anything about. That is about how much your statement is worth.

MR. FROST: My hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe), I go to work at nine o'clock in the morning, I do not lie in bed listening to radio broadcasts at ten o'clock. I am up here working.

MR. JOLLIFFE: First you told us you did not know anything about it and now you say you have not learned anything you did not know.

MR. FROST: That is why I am thinki ng ahead of some of the hon. Members. The early bird gets the worm. I do not lie around listening to radio broadcasts at ten o'clock in the morning.

AN hon. MEMBER: Waiting for worms now? It is getting pretty early.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. FROST: Well, with my hon. friend (Mr. Jolliffe) I am quite prepared to do this. If there is a way we can wind this thing up, within measurable time, I am prepared to discuss it with my hon. friends. If not, then perhaps we had better stay and clear it up, but I think if he would say to me that we meet tomorrow afternoon at, say, one-thirty, and that we would carry through some of these important matters that we have in mind for tomorrow afternoon and agree to this, that we might consider this at the conclusion of tomorrow afternoon and an hour be taken to wind up these Estimates. I am perfectly prepared to talk business on that basis.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, may I say this to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost). I am not prepared to give undertakings on behalf of other hon. members, but I think there are two or three votes still to go that are rather important and I think if they were discussed tomorrow you could probably get through them more expeditiously than you can tonight.

Now, that is my opinion, but I am not giving any undertakings as to what other hon. members may wish to say. After all, my hon. friends on my left are free men, I hope, still.

MR. SALSBERG: Yes. And I want to speak on 43.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And I would like to speak myself on 52, and possibly 49, although if somebody says what I have in mind, I will not say it.

MR. MacLEOD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I frankly--

MR. JOLLIFFE: There is a motion before the committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: Before I put that, is 42 carried?

SOME hon. MEMBERS: No.

MR. MILLARD: There is a lot of items yet.

MR. FROST: We want to pour a little oil on the troubled waters here.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The hon. member (Mr. MacLeod) can do that, too.

MR. MacLEOD: I was going to suggest that we act like sensible people.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MacLEOD: We have been here since ten o'clock this morning and, quite a number of us, have a very important committee meeting at 10.30.

MR. JOLLIFFE: And don't you be late, either.

(Take WW follows)

I do not see what is to be gained by trying to finish here now. Why do we not dispose of the motion, and let the Committee rise. Let us get on with the job we have to do tomorrow. I do not think anybody here wants to hold up the business of the House; we want to expedite it, and this is certainly not expediting the business of the House.

MR. JOLLIFFE: That is right, and I can assure the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that nothing does more to hurt things than to have the suggestion made that the Opposition is wasting time. Maybe we are, from the hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Frost) point of view, but we are human, and do not like to be told about it. Some day he will be over here, and then he will agree with me.

MR. FROST: Mr. Chairman, may we not get down to the foot of page 48, that is Vote 43, and then adjourn until tomorrow.

MR. SALSBERG: I am sorry, but I would like to say a few words on Vote 43.

MR. FROST: That is all right.

MR. TEMPLE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one comment on that vote 42. I do not know whether it comes under this item or not. But I have been looking through the Department's estimate for some expenditure on temperance education.

AN hon. MEMBER: You would.

AN hon. MEMBER: Here we go again.

MR. TEMPLE: I am just informed by my colleague that there is an item which I could not see, perhaps because it is so small, but I will discuss it further when we come to that item.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I want to make one suggestion to the hon. Minister (Mr. Frost) about item 42, and that is that in item 44, the last line; I would suggest in next year's estimates it should be more felicitously phrased "Assistance to amateur sports, $10,000.00". That may have implications which the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) may later regret.

MR. FROST: I can explain that. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) with his academic background and his connections with the Department of Education may think we are trying to "put something over on him", when we put the Athletic Commission under his direction.

But that $10,000.00 is to pay for baseball gloves and bats and balls around the province, at the instance of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Daley). We used to buy baseball bats and balls, and Lacrosse sticks.

MR. SALSBERG: How much for each constituency?

MR. JOLLIFFE: That will not affect their amateur standing?

MR. SALSBERG: How many bats and balls and gloves to each member to give away?

AN hon. MEMBER: None, for you.

MR. SALSBERG: I do not have to bribe my electors.

Item 42 agreed to.

On Item 43.

MR. SALSBERG: Mr. Chairman, on Item 43; it is a matter of policy rather than a question. On one previous occasion I suggested -- and I want to repeat it, -- and it is necessary to repeat it, because nothing was done about it -- but I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Department

should create greater opportunities for higher education --

MR. PORTER: Do not stop; I am listening.

MR. SALSBERG: I will stop until there will be silence. Now, I can hold a club over your head. I can stand here much easier than you can sit over there. You are falling asleep.

AN hon. MEMBER: I do not think you can.

MR. SALSBERG: Oh, you just woke up.

I think the Department should provide greater opportunitites for higher education --

MR. PORTER: What is your question?

MR. SALSBERG: Keep your back benchers quiet for a moment, and you will hear it. I have already stated that this was not a question. The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) of course, was not listening. I am bringing forward a matter of policy.

Now, that it is quiet I will repeat that, in my opinion, there is an opportunity in this province to provide an opportunity for higher education for the working people, who may have not have had the opportunity to complete their secondary education, because they had to go to work at an early age, and who may desire to get a University education, while working.

In the United States, such opportunities exist, and those opportunities are made use of by hundreds of thousands of people. Some of the greatest men of America got their education that way, because there were those opportunities. I might say that would apply not only to workers in the City, but to the younger people on the farms who may not have an opportunity to complete their secondary

education, and who cannot go to high school until their courses are completed, and cannot leave the farms and their jobs in the cities to go to the universities.

It is my opinion -- and I suggest it to the Department for consideration -- that supplementary examination be provided for young working people in the city and on the farms so they may complete their entrance examinations within a reasonable period, so that they will not be forced to write only once a year, but at least twice a year.

May I say that not so long ago that principle existed in this province. I know of young workers who wrote examinations for entrance to the Universities in the Spring and in the Fall.

I do not mind telling you, Mr. Chairman, that I wrote some of those in the Spring and in the Fall, while working.

MR. JOLLIFFE: The matriculation?

MR. SALSBERG: Yes, the matriculation; we used to call them "Entrance Examinations". I think that opportunity should be given to the young people of this province again, and if for any reason, you cannot provide that opportunity once, you can do so twice a year.

I think, furthermore, our Universities should provide opportunities for people to take courses in the evening, and get credits for it, and finally be entitled to a degree. May I say to the hon. members of this House that this is nothing revolutionary --

AN hon. MEMBER: It is done in London.

MR. SALSBERG: If it is done in London I did not know about it. I said "leading to a degree". If that is so, then it should be extended to all. There are opportunities for evening courses, but they do not lead to a degree.

For all I know there may hon. members of this House who might want to get a degree. Certainly it is true that thousands upon thousands of young people are compelled to

(PAGE WW6 FOLLOWS)

interrupt their education because of the restrictions which exist today.

Now, there is a school of thought, I know, that believes we are developing an aristocracy in the way of education, restricting education or opportunities to a select few, to those are either very brilliant, or financially able to attain it. I think the educational principle should be broadened, so that every person who wants an education, should be able to attain it, and the fact that he is compelled to interrupt his education at an early age or obliged to continue his work, nothing should stand in his way from attaining the objective he sets for himself.

I do not know what the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter)'s views are on that question. I would like to hear that. I hope his views will coincide more or less with mine, and that the Department will establish a policy and pursue it actively so that the institutions which now exist will be more accessible to larger numbers of people than is now the case.

I could continue, of course, but I have in mind we want to adjourn after we get through with this item, and I will conclude now in the hope that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Porter) will express at least his own opinion, if not the opinion of the government.

I want to say before I sit down that this is a matter of great concern to a large number of young people in the province of Ontario.

Any opinion?

MR. JOLLIFFE: Is the hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) going to say anything about that?

[illegible]

MR. PORTER: There is no question.

MR. SALSBERG: The hon. Minister (Mr. Porter) will not give his opinion on this question. A question is not only that which consists of a sentence or so, "how much money are you spending", or "how many buildings have you got?". I am asking for an expression of policy.

MR. PORTER: There is no intention for any change in the present policy.

MR. SALSBERG: At least you are very frank in your reactionary views.

MR. FROST: Upon looking on page 39, I see "Public libraries, traveling libraries", item 44. Might we clear that up now? The point is, Mr. Chairman, that I would like, if we meet at 2 o'clock tomorrow --

MR. MILLARD: It will not take any longer then than now.

MR. FROST: Some of the hon. members would like to get away at 3:15, but I think we might agree to continue with the remainder of the hon. members present, until, say, 4:30, and I would like to clear up this Department.

On some of the other items, could we not agree now to carry them through? For instance, there is item No.44; I should imagine that might be disposed of now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I know how the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) feels but none of us know -- I do not know -- whether anyone wants to speak in connection with item 44.

MR. FROST: If any hon. member wants to, let us clear it up now.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I did hear the hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Frost) very definitely say that we would go to the end of item 43. I accepted his assurance, as I always do.

MR. PORTER: We got along faster --

MR. SALSBERG: By not answering the question.

MR. FROST: I think there are some items here now which we might get cleared up.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No, I am sorry; I do not think so.

MR. FROST: Items 44, 45, 46 and 47.

MR. JOLLIFFE: No. It is not a matter of cooperation. May I repeat that when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) makes a statement, I accept it, believing, as I do, that he is a gentleman and a man of his word. As far as I am concerned, I expect him to live up to his word.

Item 43 agreed to.

(TAKE "XX" FOLLOWS)

MR. FROST: On the other hand, I want to be reasonable, but I am awfully anxious to get ahead with this. Are there not just a few of these items of which we might dispose? I do not want to call other items, but I think we might make a little progress.

MR. JOLLIFFE: Let us have an understanding in this House that when statements are made they will be adhered to. We will do that. The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) am sure will do the same thing.

MR. FROST: On the other hand, I could use the weight of numbers. I like to make progress. Surely we can dispose of some of these items.

MR. JOLLIFFE: I do not think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) is that kind of man.

MR. FROST: I am perfectly prepared to do this. We will adjourn at this time. I did say when we got to the end of vote 43 we would adjourn.

I will say this for the hon. members opposite. We have given, I think, the utmost co-operation, which is more than we have received from the other side. From the other side we have received nothing but obstruction. With respect to the Liberal group and the Labour-Progressive group, I think they have, in the main, been very reasonable. I would say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jolliffe) that, so far as his group is concerned, it has displayed nothing but obstructionist tactics.

MR. TEMPLE: That is not true.

MR. JOLLIFFE: May I ask who is now wasting time?

MR. FROST: I will say this, right now, that when we have the advantage in numbers which we presently have we

could sit here all night; but I want to point out to you that we are reasonable people and we like to be sensible and decent. We like to treat other people in a decent way. We could keep you here until 7 o'clock in the morning; and, the truth of the matter is that nothing would suit me better. It would serve you right.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. FROST: I am telling you what I think about you. You are a small lot. It gives me great satisfaction to have the majority of members here in the House and be able to go ahead and say that we are going to adjourn this House at the present time and I will call this item. We hope you people go home, think things over and come back and act like decent representatives of the people of Ontario.

SOME hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. GRUMMETT: The dirtiest remark I have heard in this House.

MR. FROST: I have never listened to such puerile nonsense in my life as that to which I have listened tonight.

MR. MILLARD: Feel better now?

MR. FROST: Yes; I do.

MR. MILLARD: Hurray.

MR. FROST: Now, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I move that the Committee rise and report progress.

MR. MILLARD: At least we made progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumes (the Deputy Speaker in the Chair).

MR. H.A. STEWART (Kingston): Mr. Deputy Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means begs to report progress, asks leave to sit again, and moves the adoption of the report.

Motion agreed to.

HON. LESLIE M. FROST (Prime Minister): Tomorrow we meet at 2 o'clock. I think perhaps we can go ahead with the Bill which was introduced today, and dispose of it, because it is obvious that that may be a matter of importance in the appointing and creating of the board which will be set up under that Act. I think it is desirable, if we can, to pass upon the principle involved in that Bill and send it on to the Committee on Agriculture so that committee may consider and pass on it. After all, there are interests which will await the findings of that Board, and they include various interests -- consumers, producers, labourers, and others. If it is possible we might proceed with that.

MR. MacLEOD: Will we have that Bill? Will the Bill be printed by tomorrow?

MR. FROST: Yes.

MRL GRUMMETT: I was going to suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Frost) that if the Bill was not printed at least if each group could have a copy of it so we could consider it before two o'clock that would be sufficient. Then I would think that it ought to go to the committee on Agriculture as soon as possible; but, at the same time, I would not want to consent to hasty second reading of a Bill we have not seen.

MR. FROST: I will ask the Clerk of the House if he would arrange to have copies of the Bill sent to the Leaders of the groups as early tomorrow as possible, and, if we can proceed with that bill, all right.

MR. NIXON: Or, put it in the post office boxes in the morning.

MR. FROST: Yes.

There are some other government bills which we might go ahead with and I would like to clear up the Estimates of the Department of Education following that. I think, Mr. Deputy Speaker, what we might do with the Estimates of the Department of Education is let the matter stand to the end of the day and try and wind it up by, say, 4.30 in the afternoon.

I move the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.50 of the clock a.m.

- - - - - -